The Development of the Monday Club And Its Contribution To The Conservative Party And The Modern British Right, 1961 to 1990.

Lisa Mason BA(Hons)

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the University of Wolverhampton for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

June 2004

Signature.....

Date.....19.-.10.-.04.....

Abstract

The thesis is concerned with the organisational and ideological development of the Monday Club and its contribution to the Conservative Governments, the Conservative Party and the modern British Right, from the Club's inception in 1961 to the fall of Margaret Thatcher in 1990. The significance of this investigation lies in the fact that whilst the Monday Club is much referred to, with the exception of one article, it has not been seriously studied. Yet, it has been regarded as one of the most well known groups within the Conservative Party and it was important enough for a number of Conservative MPs, including members of the Cabinet, to have become members.

The Monday Club is most frequently associated with controversial views on decolonisation and immigration, and these are explored in some detail. However, it adopted a comprehensive policy framework which the thesis addresses by looking at a range of policy areas. The thesis shows that the Club activity was intended to influence the Conservative Party and the British Right. However, while it has been claimed that the Club has influenced the Conservative Party or Conservative Government policy, the thesis argues that where Conservative policy has accorded with that of the Club, this was crucially where it shared ground with other groups on the New Right.

The study has also considered the novelty of the Club's conservatism. It espoused a particular kind of conservatism, which is best classified as radical right, a development

that left it outside the main forces driving Conservatism and Britain to the right in the closing decades of the twentieth century.

The thesis has particularly drawn on Monday Club publications, a number of interviews and access to a hitherto unused archive, the Sir Patrick Wall collection of papers, held at Hull University.

The Development of the Monday Club and its Contribution to the Conservative Party and the Modern British Right, 1961 to 1990.

Contents

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my thanks to a number of people who have helped me in my research. I am indebted firstly to my director of studies, Martin Durham who has read and commented on my work throughout the period of research and has provided material and encouragement, and to my second supervisor, Professor Andrew Gamble, who has assisted in commenting on my work and making suggestions for changes; I am grateful to both for imparting their knowledge and their experience. I would also like to express my thanks to Patrick Seyd who was willing to talk to me about his article on the Monday Club, for his suggestions as to the direction of the study and for providing me with Club material not previously accessed.

I attempted to get interviews from a number of past and present members of the Monday Club and I am very grateful to those who were willing to be interviewed. Therefore, I would like to express my appreciation to Andrew Hunter MP, Gerald Howarth MP, and Graham Webster-Gardiner, who gave me their time and were extremely helpful in imparting their knowledge on the Club and the benefit of their experience within the Club.

I am also grateful to The Bodleian Library Oxford who gave me access to the Conservative Party Archives, to Hull University who permitted access to the Sir Patrick Wall collection and to Warwick University who hold a collection of Monday Club

material. I would like to thank them not only for granting me access but also for the help I received during the visits I made there.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my husband and my family, as without their continual support and encouragement I would not have completed this thesis.

List of Abbreviations

AIA	Anglo-Irish Agreement
ANC	African National Congress
BNP	British National Party
CAF	Central African Federation
CCO	Conservative Central Office
CPC	Conservative Political Centre
CPS	Centre for Policy Studies
CRC	Community Relations Commission
CRD	Conservative Research Department
CRE	Commission for Racial Equality
CRM	Civil Rights Movement
DEA	Department of Economic Affairs
DUP	Democratic Unionist Party
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
EDC	European Defence Community
EMS	European Monetary System
FCS	Federation of Conservative Students
HINC	Halt Immigration Now Campaign
IEA	Institute of Economic Affairs
MTFS	Medium Term Financial Strategy
NCRCP	National Campaign for the Restoration of Capital Punishment
NICRA	Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association

PEST	Pressure for Economic and Social Toryism
RUC	Royal Ulster Constabulary
SDLP	Social Democratic and Labour Party
UDA	Ulster Defence Association
UPNI	Unionist Party of Northern Ireland
UUP	Ulster Unionist Party
UUUC	United Ulster Unionist Council
UWC	Ulster Workers' Council
VUP	Vanguard Unionist Party
WGUK	Western Goals UK
WISE	Welsh Irish Scottish English

Introduction

The aim of this study is to examine the organisational and ideological development of the Monday Club and its contribution to the Conservative Governments, the Conservative Party and the modern British Right, from the Club's inception in 1961 to the fall of Margaret Thatcher in 1990. The significance of this investigation lies in the fact that whilst the Monday Club has received much media attention over the years, how important it has been in Conservative politics remains to be established. The Monday Club is frequently ignored or only referred to in passing in scholarly studies of the Conservative Party and the modern British Right and those accounts that do discuss it tend to concentrate on its policy regarding race and immigration, and fail to explore the development of the organisation and its policy or evaluate its contribution to modern British Conservatism. The originality of this study is to offer a detailed analysis of the Monday Club, appraising its influence, if any on the Conservative Party and the modern British Right.

The Monday Club is worthy of study as it is "The best known of Conservative unofficial groups"[1]. Furthermore, the fact that a number of MPs joined the Club, some of whom were ministers and members of the Cabinet and Shadow Cabinets, would suggest that it should be seen to be important. It was active nationally and it was particularly active at

---

1. Neill Nugent and Roger King (eds.), The British Right, Conservatives and Right Wing Politics in Britain, Farnborough: Saxon House, 1977, p.43.

Conservative Party Conferences. After its formative years it intended to develop a framework that would challenge the Conservative Party leadership's adhesion to post war consensus politics.[2] Even if it failed to achieve this aim, this does not detract from the fact that it is worthy of study. As Roger Eatwell has argued with reference to the British National Party (BNP), the BNP failed to influence or make an impact on British politics, but nonetheless, it remains important to examine reasons why it failed in order to put the British experience in context in a broader study of extremism.[3]

In evaluating earlier work on the Club, the central contribution has been an article published in 1972 by Patrick Seyd. His article is the only commentary on the Club that raises key issues other than race and immigration, as he examines the Club's early organisational and ideological development. The purpose of Seyd's article is to investigate how the Monday Club fulfils the role of a faction within the Conservative Party. Seyd argues that the Monday Club is worthy of study because it breaks with the ideas of intra-party debate, that is to say, it is "a party within the party".[4] Despite Seyd's

---

2. Andrew Gamble, The Conservative Nation, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974, pp.106-108.

3. Roger Eatwell, "The extreme right and British exceptionalism: the primacy of politics" in Paul Hainsworth (ed.), The Politics of the Extreme Right from the Margins to the Mainstream, London: Continuum Imprint, 2000, pp. 172-192.

4. Patrick Seyd, "Factionalism within the Conservative Party: The Monday Club", Government and Opposition, Vol. 7, No.4, 1972, p.467.

valuable article, a comprehensive study on the Monday Club is now needed to extend his findings beyond the 1970s, particularly as the Club experienced in-fighting which was to result in its reputation being tarnished in the period after the article. Furthermore, Seyd's article, while showing the distinctiveness of the Club in terms of its factionalism, does not highlight enough its novelty in that it espoused a particular strand of conservatism which combined a right wing approach on race and immigration, empire and anti-communism, with neo-liberalism on economics. (As we shall see, however, it also contained a minority of members who adhered to protectionist and interventionist policies). Other aspects that need more extensive treatment is the Club's ability to bring people into the Party that might not have joined and how it acted as a voice of dissent that many members would have found difficult to express individually due to Party loyalty.

Other commentators have discussed the Club more briefly. Martin Walker, in The National Front, focussed on the alleged infiltration of the Club by the National Front in the late 1960s and early 1970s.[5] Likewise, Martin Durham in The Failure of British Fascism, examines the National Front's relationship with the Monday Club.[6] Zig Layton-

---

5. Martin Walker, The National Front, London: Fontana, 1977, pp.108-139.

6. Martin Durham, "The Conservative Party, the British Extreme Right and the Problem of Political Space, 1967-83" in Mike Cronin (ed.), The Failure of British Fascism: The Far Right and the Fight for Political Recognition, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1996, pp.89-94.

Henry in Conservative Party Politics comments on the Club's reaction to immigration legislation.[7] David Edgar in "Bitter Harvest" again focuses on the Club's race and immigration policy and suggests that its in-fighting in the early 1970s had resulted in its so called 'demise'.[8] As suggested earlier, the main focus of attention for these and other commentators has been the Club's race and immigration policy. Although the studies mentioned above are of worth in their contribution to knowledge on the Club, they do not look at the Club as a whole and they do not consider the Club's other policies.

The study has involved close analysis of Monday Club publications and secondary sources in order to explore the development of the Club's policy, to gain an understanding of the divisions in the Club, to assess its relationship to other groupings in the British Right, and to identify the key questions with which the Club was concerned. Published primary sources were examined some of which were written by individuals and some by the Club's study groups and policy committees. (The literature was not assumed to be aligned with the general political thought of the Club unless specifically so stated by the Club's executive). The study has also examined unpublished material held in the Conservative Party Archives at the Bodleian Library, Oxford (referred to in footnotes as

---

7. Zig Layton-Henry (ed.), Conservative Party Politics, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1980, pp.62-66.

8. David Edgar, "Bitter Harvest" in John Curran (ed.), The Future of the Left, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984, pp.39-57.

CPA or CCO – Conservative Central Office papers) (it is important here to note that there were restrictions placed on access to material from the time Mrs Thatcher became Party leader) and the Sir Patrick Wall Collection of Papers, held at Hull University (referred to in footnotes as DPW). Sir Patrick Wall's collection of private papers was recently deposited at Hull and has not been used in any previous study of the Club.[9]

The study was also able to draw on oral interviews that were conducted with former members of the Monday Club. These have been used with the awareness of the problems associated with oral history, such as: accuracy of memory; the element of bias in interviewees' response to questions; unwillingness to recall 'difficult' situations such as when Andrew Hunter denied any Club members were members of the World Anti-Communist League.[10] Hence, although the oral interviews have been a valuable source of research, the material was used with caution. The Monday Club was approached for interview; however, the Club's executive declined.

---

9. When using private papers, it has to be considered that there may have been some 'pruning' of the collection. Although this is not proven, within the Sir Patrick Wall collection it is surprising, for instance, that there is little material on the Club and South Africa. While this thesis contains some references to South Africa, in the absence of further documentation, I have not discussed it at length.

10. Interview with Andrew Hunter, 8th June 1998.

The study adopted two approaches when examining the Monday Club's ideology and organisational development. In examining texts by or on the Club, it has been important to be aware of the ongoing debate on the interpretation of texts. The study has been influenced by Barthes and others, who argue that texts do not have a single authoritative meaning.[11] The study therefore has been conscious of the strains between authorial intent and the text. In addition the study was also aware of ambiguity of the literature that could have arisen from situations such as editorial changes to an original text or articles having been incorrectly proof read. This could result in a lack of clarity in the argument being presented. While the discussion of documentary evidence is crucial to this thesis, it has been undertaken with caution.

The thesis covers the period of 1961 to 1990. This time period has been chosen as it runs from the inauguration of the Club to the end of the Thatcher Governments. This cut-off date was chosen for two reasons, firstly because of claims of Monday Club influence on the Thatcher administrations[12] and secondly, these dates offer a period of approximately three decades which enables the study to use sufficient evidence to attempt to assess and evaluate the influence the Monday Club may have had on the Conservative Party and the

---

11. Raman Selden (ed.), The Theory Of Criticism: From Plato to The Present, Harlow: Longman Group Ltd., 1988, pp.76-77 and p.187.

12. Edgar, op. cit., p.56.

modern British Right.

Before examining the areas of key interest to the Club, we need to discuss both how we might best understand it as a form of right-wing politics and in what ways it has developed from its inception. In the first chapter, we discuss its relationship to Conservatism and to the British Right. In the second, we focus on the Club's development against the backdrop of the political, social and economic issues that prevailed during the period in which the Club has been studied. This chapter examines how the Club changed over the period in terms of membership, leadership and problems it encountered. After giving an overall sense of the organisational development of the Monday Club during the period, the thesis then moves on to a number of key areas of thinking and activity for the Club. The third chapter focuses on the subject that gave rise to the creation of the Club: Africa and the loss of the empire. Although the Club was concerned with decolonisation as a whole, once it became obvious that there was little the Club could do to prevent it, the Club turned its attentions to attempting to moderate its unfolding in Rhodesia. Hence, the majority of this chapter is devoted to Rhodesia. The fourth chapter is on the Club's race and immigration policy, which is the aspect most associated with the Club and has been the policy most commentators have focused on. The Club's relationship with extreme right organisations, such as the National Front (an issue also referred to in chapter two) will also be examined in this chapter. The next three chapters focus on other issues that are important to the Club. The fifth chapter is on the Club's economic policy, which although not central to the Club's initial policy framework, has been very important to the British Right in general. As we shall see,

economics became more important to the Club when its attempts to curb decolonisation had failed. This chapter also has another significance in that it highlights ways in which the Club's economic policies may have conflicted with its views on immigration. The sixth chapter is on Northern Ireland, which for the Club was highly pertinent due to its strong affinity to the maintenance to the British Nation. The seventh chapter is on Europe, an issue that divided the Right and was problematic for the Club. The eighth chapter is the concluding chapter, which will evaluate and assess the Club's contribution to the Conservative Party and the modern British Right. This chapter will explore to what extent the Club influenced the Conservative Party, successive Conservative Governments and the modern British Right, as well as defining the type of conservatism held by the Club.

Chapter One: The Monday Club and Conservatism

The Monday Club exists both within the different strands that make up the Conservative Party and the somewhat broader constellation of groupings, some Conservative, some not, that constitute the British Right. In the chapters which follow we will discuss the Club's development in the sixties, seventies and eighties. Firstly, however, we will examine the vexed question of how we might begin to ideologically locate the Club and the groupings with which it co-operated and competed with during the years in question. We have not, as yet, examined the Club's development in detail. But what ways of understanding Conservatism and the British Right are likely to prove most useful in discussing the Club? To explore this, we will firstly set out the most ambitious attempt at analysing Conservatism, that of Michael Freeden. We will then turn our attention to recent attempts to discuss differences within Conservatism and the Right more broadly.

Freeden's approach to analysing what constitutes Conservatism involves two "substantive core" concepts.[1] The first is a resistance to change unless the change is natural or organic.[2] As one scholar puts it, he notes, Conservatism is discriminating in its

---

1. Michael Freeden, Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, p.344.

2. Ibid.

defence of the social order, only supporting that change which is respectful of the past.[3]

Freeden's second core component of Conservatism is the "extra-human origins of the social order".[4] The securing of order is not at the whim of human will, but the forces or laws that guide human behaviour are seen by different Conservatives in different forms, such as "God, history, biology and science". Thus in the nineteenth century, "my station and its duties" were crucial, while in the post war era the natural order has been often seen as reliant upon "'scientific' economic laws".[5]

If these are Freeden's core concepts, he links them to two other features. One is the characteristic of Conservatism as reactive, forging arguments that are compatible with the core concepts but are specifically related to the threats which Conservatives perceive.[6] The other, he suggests, is flexibility, whereby Conservatism has proved remarkably able to change position while still defending order and resisting undesired change.[7]

---

3. Ibid., pp.323-3.

4. Ibid., p.334.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., p.336.

7. Ibid., p.338.

Freeden deploys this understanding of Conservatism to make sense of the shifts from arguing against laissez-faire to opposing state intervention that have taken place in the post-war party. He applies it, in particular, to Thatcherism and the New Right. (Sadly he makes no reference to the Monday Club). But he is not centrally concerned with differences within modern Conservatism or the British Right more broadly and for this, we will need to turn elsewhere.[8]

In recent years a number of different attempts have been made to understand these differences. It would not be advisable to consider them all or to discuss every strand of Conservatism they claim to have uncovered. What would be useful, however, would be to see which can prove most fruitful in understanding the Club and the other forms of the British Right with which we are concerned. In an article by David Baker, Andrew Gamble and Steve Ludlam a number of typologies are examined, the purpose of which was to evaluate efforts to define Conservatives' positions on Europe.[9] While this study will draw on both this article and some of the typologies it discusses, those aspects that

---

8. Ibid., pp.348-414.

9. David Baker, Andrew Gamble and Steve Ludlam, "The Current Problems of the Conservative Party"; Patrick Dunleavy and Jeffrey Stanyer (eds.), Contemporary Political Studies, Belfast: PSA of the UK, 1994, pp.278-297.

will be highlighted are those that might prove most illuminating in understanding the Monday Club. For this purpose four typologies will be considered, firstly W.H.Greenleaf's, then Patrick Dunleavy's, then Philip Norton's and Arthur Aughey's, and finally Andrew Gamble's.

The first typology sees Conservatism, as with the British political tradition as a whole, as split into two branches: libertarianism and collectivism.[10] As Baker et al suggest, Greenleaf argues that the factor that distinguishes these two categories is the approach to economics.[11] Greenleaf holds that libertarians want limited government (decentralisation of power), private enterprise and individual freedom, whereas collectivism focuses on the role of the government whereby the State provides welfare, is concerned with redistribution of wealth and can be viewed as 'authoritarian'.[12] Expanding on this

---

10. W. H. Greenleaf, "The Character of Modern British Conservatism"; Robert Benewick, R. N. Berki and Bhikhu Parekh (eds.), Knowledge and Belief in Politics: the Problem of Ideology, London: George Allen & Uniwin Ltd., 1973, p.184.

11. Baker, Gamble and Ludlam, op. cit., p.279.

12. Greenleaf, op. cit., p.181.

Greenleaf suggests that the liberterian strand can be divided into two groups; the laissez faire doctrine and "a traditional constitutional libertarianism",[13] the latter describing those who support "a modified position which draws a firm distinction between social and economic intervention" with social intervention being acceptable and economic intervention not.[14]

This typology has some use when examining the Monday Club. As we shall see later, the Monday Club at times contains both the libertarian and collectivist elements. Libertarian in the sense that it came to favour private enterprise, but at the same time it adhered to a more authoritarian state with strong law and order.

Dunleavy identifies six types of Conservatism, using the term Tory to refer to those who have an affinity for authority and organic development. To understand the different types of Conservatism, Dunleavy develops an ideological map, which includes the Traditional Far Right and Tory Paternalists, both of which favour strong government and Market Liberals and Tory Technocrats, which are more inclined towards individualism. He

---

13. Ibid., p.202.

14. Ibid., pp.194-195.

proposes that the Traditional Far Right and the Market Liberals are linked by their overtly inegalitarian stance. Likewise the Tory Technocrats and the Tory Paternalists shared the acceptance of the welfare state.[15]

As defined by Dunleavy, Tory Paternalism is 'One nation Toryism', such as that of Disraeli and as we shall see, Macmillan, accepting the need for change, displaying an affinity for gradual reform and pragmatic with regard to economics.[16] Dunleavy's definition of a Tory Technocrat is where Government is expected to guide national life whereby industry would be restructured and institutions would be reorganised, in order to promote economic development. For a Tory Technocrat, emphasis would be placed on the economy and intervention would not be ruled out.[17]

The Market Liberal, as defined by Dunleavy, espouses free market economics and a minimalist State, entailing curbing the trade unions and privatisation. The Traditional Far

---

15. Patrick Dunleavy et al (eds.), Developments in British Politics 4, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1993, p.127.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid., p.128.

Right has an affinity to a strong style of Government. It has a commitment to the maintenance of the 'British' way of life with the defense of traditions and of hierarchy.[18] However, it opposes Government intervention in the economy unless it is in the form of farming subsidies which are seen to protect the "British way of life."[19] Both of these definitions, as will be shown later, have considerable relevance to the Monday Club and will be important in assessing its Conservatism. In contrast, the first two strands discussed, Tory Paternalist and Tory Technocrat, most certainly are not. Indeed, it is those forms of Conservatism that the Club sought to defeat.

Our third typology, that of Philip Norton and Arthur Aughey, claims that, "The historical experience of the Conservative Party has been its ability to accommodate such diversity".[20] The Party, they hold, "is a rich amalgam of different traditions and approaches to political problems based upon different groups but there is also sufficient continuity... for these approaches to be recognisably Conservative".[21] They identified

---

18. Ibid., p.126.

19. Ibid., p.127.

20. Philip Norton and Arthur Aughey, Conservative and Conservatism, London: Temple Smith, 1981, p.57.

21. Ibid., p.59.

two main types of Conservatism, Whig and Tory, but they also noted a number of subdivisions within these two branches. Within the Tory wing there are a number of tendencies. Tory pessimists, who believe in the myth of the golden age of Conservatism, are critical of modern society and are fearful of change. Tory Paternalists adhere to the idea of privilege, duty and service. The Tory progressives have the element of paternalism, but their main goal is economic growth, full employment and the re-distribution of wealth.[22] The Combative Tory is critical of attempts to undermine values and standards in society; this strand is reactionary and claims to have a commonsense approach to politics.[23] The Combative Tory holds with the notion of thrift, "self-reliance" and "self help", and are therefore against any financial dependence on the state.[24]

Within the Whig branch Norton and Aughey identified two recognisable tendencies. The Corporate Whig, where economic priorities are dealt with in a business-like manner. This strand is categorised as favouring incomes policy, Government giving financial support

---

22. Ibid., p.78.

23. Ibid., pp.66-68.

24. Ibid., p.83.

to industry, pro large capital and anti monetary policy.[25] The other Whig branch, the neo-liberals, favours small private capital and opposes collectivism. It supports a limited state role and free enterprise, seeing this as the only truly productive way for the economy.[26] As we shall see, the Club is certainly recognisable as owing much to neo-liberalism, while the term 'Combative Tory' does point us to some of the other aspects of the Club, for which the phrase 'liberal' might seem somewhat inappropriate.

Our fourth typology, that of Andrew Gamble, identifies four distinct groups: Right progressive, Whig diehard, Imperialist diehard and New Right. He distinguishes these tendencies on the basis of how they reacted to the so-called postwar settlement.[27] The Right progressives were in support of full employment and accepting of the welfare state; supporting the "extension of the state sector on political and economic grounds."[28] They became the dominant section, Gamble claims, within the Party after the Conservative

---

25. Ibid., p.86.

26. Ibid., p.88.

27. Gamble, op. cit., 1974, p.9.

28. Ibid., p.43.

Party's post war election defeat.[29] The antithesis of this is the Whig diehard strand which is against intervention in the economy, opposes high taxation and high government expenditure. The Whig diehard supports laissez faire and free market economics and, according to Gamble, came to represent the interests of small business after 1945.[30]

The Imperialist diehard stance, Gamble claims, is the "ideology of national greatness"[31] as it identifies Britain's greatness with its role as an imperial power. It favours imperial preference and opposes the Atlantic alliance. In short, the imperialist diehard calls for "a vigorous imperial policy to underpin national economic strength".[32]

Gamble suggests that the final category, the New Right "embraced what remained of the old diehard tendancy – both Whig and imperialist - but it also gathered new elements."[33] He has described the New Right as blaming society's ills on the post war settlement. The

---

29. Ibid., p.38.

30. Ibid., p.213.

31. Ibid., p.75.

32. Ibid., p.214.

33. Ibid., p.217.

New Right, he suggests, "is identified with opposition to state involvement in the economy" and are "advocates of national discipline and strong defence."[34] For the purpose of this study the terms New Right and Imperialist diehard are most useful in understanding the Club. However, as we will see, before we can decide on the terminology that is most appropriate, we will need to revisit the New Right term again.

There are a number of other typologies, for example, Whiteley, Seyd and Richardson's[35] which distinguishes between traditionalists, progressives and individualists. However, the four I have discussed can prove particularly useful in understanding the Club. The term neo-liberalism, for instance, although appropriate for discussing major aspects of the Club, does not capture its enthusiasm for empire or for order. Terms such as Imperialist

---

34. Andrew Gamble, Free Economy and Strong State: The Politics of Thatcherism, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1988, p.28.

35. Paul Whiteley, Patrick Seyd and Jeremy Richardson, True Blues: The Politics of Conservative Party Membership, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

diehard or Combative Tory may do so. So too might the term New Right. For some writers, it is defined as another term for neo-liberal. Thus for David Green, the New Right view lies "in the common traditions of western classical liberalism"[36], focussing essentially on classical liberal economics and the libertarian belief in a minimalist state.[37] While for Norman Barry, the new Right is a "classical liberal or individualistic" stance.[38] However, Gamble uses it more broadly to crystalise the backlash not only against Right Progressive economics but also against the social permissiveness of the sixties and beyond. The Club can be seen both as economically neo-liberal and, in Gamble's sense, part of a broad new Right. But what of its relationship to the extreme right that arose in Britain from the sixties onwards?

Having earlier established that Conservatism can be defined as having a common set of ideas, we can see the same for the British Right more broadly. Eatwell sees the Right as being comprised of a number of strands which all have a common link in the fact that

---

36. David G. Green, The New Right: The Counter Revolution in Political, Economic and Social Thought, Brighton: Wheatsheaf Books, 1987, p.1.

37. Ibid., pp.2-3.

38. Norman P. Barry, The New Right, Beckenham: Croom Helm Ltd., 1987, p.2.

they were born out of a reaction to the left.[39] He uses five categories for the right: the new right, reactionary right, moderate right, radical right and extreme right.[40] He claims that the reactionary right and the moderate right developed in response to 18th century individualist liberalism. The radical and extreme right strands, Eatwell argues, emerged as a response to late 19th and early 20th century "socialist movements". He suggests the new right strand developed as "a response to socialist governments".[41]

Eatwell's reactionary right seeks a return to an "idealized past"; it is "aristocratic, religious and authoritarian."[42] The moderate right is akin to Burke's conservatism due to the emphasis placed on institutions, "such as the family or nation and the importance of religion".[43] The radical right is seen as more difficult to define than the other styles of Right wing thought. Eatwell argues that it is strongly anti-Communist and is authoritarian.[44] Its focus is on nationalism, activism and "salvation through politics".[45] In

---

39. Roger Eatwell and Noel O' Sullivan (eds.), The Nature of the Right, London: Pinter Publishers, 1989, p.19.

40. Ibid., p.63.

41. Ibid.

42. Ibid.

43. Ibid., p.66.

44. Ibid., p.124.

45. Ibid.

essence, Eatwell claims, it is a term that refers to a body of right wing thought outside the norm.[46] In distinguishing between the radical right and the extreme right, he focuses on the extreme right's use of propaganda and myth, which, he argues, tells people "what to think rather than how to think". Whereas the radical right, he claims does not use myth and propaganda in this way, rather he suggests, they use it more subtly to create a "good citizen".[47]

Eatwell raises the key question of a distinction between the new right, the radical and the extreme right. More recently, this has been addressed by Cas Mudde. The extreme right, explains Mudde, like Conservatism has different factions but there is a central core that is shared which distinguishes it as extreme right. Its core components are: nationalism, xenophobia, welfare chauvinism and the strong state.[48] Nationalism is characterised by the adherence to the unity of the state and "cultural homogeneity".[49] Xenophobia is described by Mudde as being threatened by anything "alien or deviating from their own

---

46. Ibid., p.68.

47. Ibid., p.71.

48. Cas Mudde, The Ideology of the Extreme Right, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000, p.11.

49. Ibid., p.171.

nation and conventions."[50] The welfare chauvinism possessed by the extreme right is where the output of the national economy and economic policies should only benefit its own people and thus not immigrants.[51] The strong state, Mudde argues, focuses on the importance of the rule of law and order so as to maintain a well ordered community.[52] Mudde discusses the problem of defining whether the core ideology is exclusively extreme right or whether in fact it is shared by other groups such as the New Right.[53] He argues that the distinction between the two is that the New Right has a primacy of economics whereas the extreme right has a primacy of politics. The extreme right rejects the New Right affinity to free market economics, favouring the collective rather than the individual.[54] In addition, Mudde states that the New Right focuses on the individual unlike the extreme right that focuses on the collective.[55] Using these distinctions Mudde is able to separate the 'neo-conservatives' from the extreme right. Mudde also seeks to

---

50. Ibid., p.172.

51. Ibid., p.174.

52. Ibid., p.173.

53. Ibid., p.177.

54. Ibid., p.178.

55. Ibid.

distinguish between the extreme right and the radical right. Mudde acknowledges, however, that the term radical right is often used interchangeably with extreme right. He notes two possible distinctions. One concerns an American usage, where the radical right is categorised as combining "ultranationalism and anti-communism, Christian fundamentalism, militaristic orientation and anti-alien sentiment."[56] The other usage is from modern Germany, where certain parties are seen as outside of the democratic mainstream but not explicitly opposed to the constitution and democracy.[57] He is unpersuaded of the usefulness of this distinction for the parties he is studying which, he argues, are not overtly opposed to democracy.[58] Furthermore, where he does demonstrate the extreme right from other groupings, it is from the New Right. Those Conservatives who stand between the extreme right and the New Right do not feature in his discussion. Nonetheless, the term that he briefly refers to, though does not deploy, may well prove useful in discussing the organisation with which we are concerned.

While both Eatwell and Mudde are helpful, we lack a really compelling discussion of what in Western Europe, as distinct from America, we might call the radical right. Mudde, for instance, is very useful in discussing the characteristics of the National Front

---

56. Ibid., p.13.

57. Ibid., p.12.

58. Ibid., p.181.

of the seventies, he is not so useful in enabling us to understand the Club in the same period. What both he and Eatwell do, however, is to begin to trace out how we might see the Club is having some similarities to but, crucially, key differences from other forces that argued against immigration in the period and which likewise argued that, more broadly, the Conservative Party was leading Britain in the wrong direction.

So, with a grasp of the importance of the categories of neo-liberal, 'combative Tory', Imperialist diehard and the New Right, we will turn our attention to the development of the Monday Club and how these and theoretical categories can be brought to bear on its role in British politics in the sixties, seventies and eighties. But most importantly, we will draw on the concept of a radical right distinct both from the extreme right and the New Right. It is this, we shall argue, which will prove the most productive conceptualisation of the place of the Monday Club in British politics.

Chapter Two: Organisational Development

In the aftermath of World War II, the Attlee Government, intending to preserve Britain's interests throughout the world, focussed much of its attention on the Empire and the special relationship with the USA. Despite relinquishing control over India in 1947, Britain remained, at this time, determined to maintain control over the colonies. One of the reasons for this, as will be discussed in the third chapter, was that the colonies could assist with the economic difficulties Britain faced after the War.[1] This was also the stance adopted by Churchill's Government which followed the Atlee Government in 1951.

Britain did not relinquish control of its Empire until after the Suez Crisis in 1956, which marked the turning point in Britain's attitude towards its colonies. The French and Israeli Governments attempted to oust the nationalist Nasser Government in Egypt, which had demonstrated to other colonial nations that imperialist control could be questioned. By January 1957, Eden (who had succeeded Churchill in 1955) had resigned and Harold Macmillan became Prime Minister. Macmillan's initial action with regard to the colonies was to have the Colonial Policy Committee examine each colony to see which ones were "ripe for independence in the near future". He instructed that the colonies were to be

---

1. John Callaghan, Great Power Complex: British Imperialism, International Crises and National Decline,1914-51, London: Pluto Press, 1997, p.99.

looked at in terms of which ones could become full Commonwealth members and what could be done with those that were not, and asked for a plan to be drawn up on what could "be gained or lost by decolonising" certain colonies.[2] Hence, by the late 1950s a policy of decolonisation had been adopted by Harold Macmillan's Government. Macmillan began his visits to the African continent in December 1959 and it was the following month he addressed the South African Parliament with the so-called 'Winds of Change' speech:

"The most striking of all impressions I have formed since I left London a month ago is the strength of this African national consciousness. In different forms, but it is happening everywhere. The wind of change is blowing through this continent, and whether we like it or not, this growth of national consciousness is a practical fact. We must all accept it as a fact and our national policies must take account of it."[3]

The Monday Club was established in response to this speech. Even the name of the Club commemorates the day the speech was made, referred to as 'Black Monday.'[4] The Club

---

2. W. David McIntyre, British Decolonisation, 1946- 1997, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1998, p.45.

3. David Childs, Britain Since 1945, London: Ernst Benn, 1979, p.187.

4. Gamble, 1974, op. cit., p.177.

claimed Macmillan had 'turned the Party Left'[5] which resulted, it argued, in many Conservatives becoming dispirited and disillusioned. It aimed to rectify the balance within the Party by upholding and promoting what it saw as traditional Conservative values. At this stage the purpose of the Club was to bring together like-minded Conservatives "to discuss political issues" of the day, in particular, the decolonisation of Africa.[6] Here we can see as noted earlier the notion of the Club taking an Imperialist diehard stance.

In its early stages, the Club was a small London based group of younger members of the Conservative Party. It had a restricted membership policy, which ruled that all full members had to be under thirty-five years of age and a member of the Conservative Party (those over the age of thirty-five could, however, become associate members). The age restriction was deliberate, as it was the initial members' intention to prove that not all young Conservative members were interested in joining the supposedly left-wing Conservative grouping, the Bow Group.[7] At this point of the Club's development, it did not propose to become a mass organisation. However, the Club's first Chairman, Paul

---

5. Robert Copping, The Story of the Monday Club, Westcliff-on-Sea: Current Affairs Information Service, 1972, p.5.

6. Seyd, op. cit., p.469.

7. Nugent and King (eds.), op. cit., p.43.

Bristol, attempted to attract members by visiting Conservative constituency associations to meet with Party activists.[8] (For a full list of Club Chairmen from 1961 to 1990, see Appendix 1 at the end of the chapter).

Initially, the Club met every Monday to discuss political issues on a rather informal basis, producing literature propounding its views. In late 1962 and early 1963 study groups were formed on African Affairs and the Middle East, the Commonwealth, Education, Agriculture, Defence, Foreign Affairs, Industry and Finance, and Labour and Industrial Relations.[9] The purpose of these study groups was to produce policies, which were published in policy papers and pamphlets. Early pamphlets included Winds of Change or Whirlwind? which focussed on decolonisation in African nations, and Strike out or Strike Bound which examined industrial relations.

By July 1963, the Club had only 198 members; hence a recruitment campaign was launched along with a 'push' to establish more provincial groups. Groups were established later that year in nine Conservative association areas; these included West Midlands, Northwest, Southeast, Scotland and Wales.[10] By this time, the Club had

---

8. Seyd, op. cit., p.469.

9. Copping, 1972, op. cit., pp.5-6 and DPW/40/1, memo on study groups.

10. DPW/40/1, minutes of Executive Council meeting, 15th July 1963.

managed to attract some Conservative MPs who later held key positions within the Club: Paul Williams, Victor Goodhew and John Biggs-Davison each joined in 1962. They were followed by Ronald Bell, Patrick Wall and Harold Soref in 1963.

With the wish to attract members came the desire to formulate a policy framework. The Club considered its study groups as an important part of its framework, and J.J. Francis, Chairman of the study groups, called on all members to become involved in groups. In September 1963, Francis stated in a letter to members that the aim of the study groups was "to provide the research on which the Conservative Party can advance within the limits of Toryism."[11] The Club's application forms from 1962/3 included a section that asked members which study groups they were interested in.[12]

The policy aims of the Monday Club in 1963 were still centred on the African colonies and as we will discuss further in chapter two, its stance remained opposed to decolonisation. The Club's Chairman, Paul Bristol, supported the Central African Federation (CAF - established in 1953 by North and South Rhodesia and Nyasaland in order to maintain white leadership), and opposed the policies of the Colonial Secretary, Iain Mcleod.[13] In addition, however, the Club stated it was anxious to strengthen the

---

11. DPW/40/1, letter to members, September 1963.

12. DPW/40/1, application form 1962/3.

13. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.6.

Commonwealth; in a press statement from the Club in 1963, it declared that it "advocated the growth of a multiracial Commonwealth, but frequently expressed its anxiety about the speed at which certain African countries have moved to independence."[14]

The 1964 General Election defeat of the Conservatives marked a turning point in Conservative Party policy, with "the party's ideological return to basic principles."[15] This needs to be understood in terms of what has been dubbed the New Right. As Brendan Evans and Andrew Taylor note, there were some groups and individuals who can be so described.[16] Some, such as the Centre for Policy Studies (CPS) or the Adam Smith Institute, would emerge later. Already, however, the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) had been established and Enoch Powell was becoming a national figure. Andrew Gamble has described the New Right as a "Rejection" of the post war political consensus. As he suggests, "the New Right is identified with opposition to state involvement in the economy" and "advocates of national discipline and strong defence."[17] As yet, as subsequent shifts in Conservative priorities would demonstrate, the New Right was only beginning to make an impact. In the following decade, with the rise of Thatcherism, it

---

14. DPW/40/1, press statement, October 1963.

15. Brendan Evans and Andrew Taylor, From Salisbury to Major: Continuity and Change in Conservative Politics, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996, p.141.

16. Ibid., p.142.

17. Gamble, op. cit., 1988, p.28.

would be of far greater importance. Nevertheless, the Party first veered away from post-war consensus politics following the 1964 Election defeat, finding economic liberalism more attractive. It was at this time that the Party also decided to change its leadership selection policy. The Party adopted a procedure, which involved Conservative MPs voting for the leader. Edward Heath was the first Party leader to be elected under this new system, in 1965.[18]

1964 also saw the Monday Club considering its future. Following the Club's AGM, in February that year, a report was produced by the Club's Executive Council that looked at the Club's function and how it should be defined. In the report it was suggested that the Monday Club "should cease to be the exclusive preserve of the right and should attract and embrace every colour of opinion in the Conservative Party." The Club dismissed this recommendation, arguing that it did not want to be akin to the Bow Group.[19] Another suggestion by the Club's Executive Council was: "The Monday Club should be a ginger group, a nagging conscience and a spur and stimulant to the Party or Government to act on true Tory principles."[20] It was also argued that there was a danger of the Club becoming an "inert refuge of the Right." The report recommended that to make the Club more active it should consider the following suggestions: attract a bigger Parliamentary

---

18. Evans and Taylor, op. cit., pp.142-4.

19. DPW/40/2, minutes from Club's AGM, February 1964, p.1.

20. Ibid., p.2.

Group; have a more concerted attack on socialism; develop policies for the next Conservative Government; implement a charter for the Monday Club; increase members.[21] By 1964, the Monday Club's recruitment drive was showing limited success; however, more MPs had joined that year. MP membership now included R. Dudley Williams, Joseph Hiley, J. Hollingsworth, J. Lucas, A. Pannell, W. Teeling and Jasper More.[22]

The Monday Club Chairman Paul Williams, was, during the period of 1965 to 1968, a member of the Conservative Party Foreign Affairs Policy Group. In The Story of the Monday Club, written by Club member Robert Copping, Williams was described as having "shaped" the Monday Club "into a coherent force" as it was composed of "a mixed assortment of right wing thinkers"; this was credited to Williams' ability and experience as a politician.[23] John Ramsden reports in The Making of Conservative Party Policy that the Club tried to get another member onto the Parliamentary Committee for Foreign Affairs, but as Williams was already on the Committee, the Club was told that its views were already represented.[24] In line with Monday Club thinking, Williams expressed

---

21. Ibid., pp.1-2.

22. DPW/40/2, minutes of Executive Council meeting, May 1964.

23. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.8.

24. John Ramsden, The Making of Conservative Party Policy: The Conservative Research Department Since 1929, London: Longman, 1980, p.246.

a concern that there was no Conservative Party Committee on Commonwealth Affairs. In May 1965, the Conservative Party did establish a Commonwealth Policy Group Affairs Committee.[25]

By 1965 Club membership had increased marginally to 400.[26] However, from this time onwards the Club embarked on a course to develop into a mass organisation. When interviewed, Gerald Howarth suggested that this was partly as a result of the Conservative Party having suffered another election defeat and the Club felt it necessary to "push the Party in the true direction" to win back electoral support.[27] In order to achieve this, it dropped its restrictive membership policy, so members no longer had to be members of the Conservative Party or under the age of 35. It also established more regional branches, University branches and impermanent study groups to analyse topical political issues. An Executive Council had also been established to control administration and general policy.[28] At this time, it was the Club's intention to attract membership from those who were not necessarily members of the Conservative Party but who were aligned

---

25. Ibid., p.247.

26. David Michaels, "Monday Club Discovers Maurras", Patterns of Prejudice, March/April 1972, p.14.

27. Interview with Gerald Howarth, 29th April 1998.

28. Seyd, op. cit., p.470.

to right wing politics. The Club argued that the "Conservative Party had swung so far to the left that the floating voter could hardly detect any differences between it and the Socialists."[29] Following 1965, the Club's membership appeared to have increased quite considerably, and membership was given a boost after Ian Smith's Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) in Rhodesia (to be discussed at length in chapter three). Some of the ex-Club members interviewed, as will be discussed later, cited this as their main reason for joining the Club.[30]

With the Club's attempts to expand and exert influence, its attention turned to how it was viewed by the Conservative Parliamentary Party. In mid 1965, the minutes of the Club's Executive Council expressed its concern over bias against the Monday Club in the Party. The issue had been raised with the Conservative Party's Director, Edward du Cann, who denied this accusation; however, he did agree to look into the behaviour of the Conservative Political Centre (CPC).[31] This concern was particularly relevant as in March 1966 the CPC refused to publish a proposed newspaper for the Monday Club titled "Britain Awake!" which, the Club claimed, would put "the non-socialist element against the socialist doctrinaire." The idea of the newspaper was shelved.[32] In June 1966, the

---

29. The Aims of the Monday Club, London: Monday Club, 1967, p.1.

30. Interviews with Gerald Howarth, 29th April 1998 and Andrew Hunter, 8th June 1998.

31. DPW/40/3, minutes of Executive Council meeting, 14th June 1965.

32. DPW/40/3, minutes of Executive Council meeting, 22nd September 1965.

Conservative Party asked the Bow Group to conduct a study on its behalf regarding capital taxation.[33] Paul Williams claimed discrimination in a letter to Edward du Cann and asked if the Monday Club would be asked by the Party to do the same.[34]

On 11th November 1965 political turmoil in Rhodesia resulted in Ian Smith declaring UDI. In response, the Monday Club established an emergency committee and a public meeting was held at *Caxton Hall, Westminster on 22nd November 1965. The meeting was* a joint venture between the Monday Club's Emergency Rhodesia Committee and the Anglo-Rhodesian Society. The Anglo-Rhodesian Society was established in September 1965 following the demise of the organisation, Friends of Rhodesia, which had been established by the Rhodesian High Commission. The Anglo-Rhodesian Society was funded by the Rhodesian Front Government.[35] Cross-membership existed between the two organisations and co-operation with the Monday Club was welcomed, for instance with the involvement of Sir Patrick Wall and Stephen Hastings. The Club's link with the Anglo-Rhodesian Society was confirmed by the Club's Executive at a Council meeting a few years later, when it was stated that, "We welcome the assistance of the Anglo-

---

33. CPA CCO 20/43/1, 13th June 1966.

34. CPA CCO 20/43/1, 16th June 1966.

35. Stephen Dorril and Robin Ramsay, Smear! Wilson and the Secret State, London: Grafton, 1992, p.96.

Rhodesia Society, we work in harmony with them and we welcome them as members of the Monday Club."[36]

With the advent of UDI, the British Government issued sanctions against Ian Smith's regime. These sanctions were voted on yearly in the Commons from December 1965 onwards. The Rhodesian Sanctions Order, as we shall see in chapter three, proved problematic for successive Governments, with some members of the Conservative Party consistently voting against the Order.

With the announcement of UDI and the adoption of sanctions against Rhodesia by the British Government, the Club's Rhodesia Emergency Committee embarked on a campaign in support of Ian Smith. It suggested titles for a slogan for its campaign: "Monday Club against sanctions – from the start"; "Monday Club says hands off Rhodesia"; and "Monday Club say peace in Southern Africa". The eventual slogan that the Club adopted for the campaign was: "Scrap sanctions, talk now."[37] In addition, a petition produced by the Anglo-Rhodesian Society against sanctions was sent to all Club members.[38]

---

36. DPW/40/7, minutes of Executive Council meeting, 4th November 1968.

37. DPW/40/3, minutes of Rhodesia Emergency Committee meeting, 22nd November 1965.

38. DPW/40/7, Anglo-Rhodesian Society Petition.

A further meeting held in February 1966, regarding Government sanctions against Rhodesia, received media attention. It was claimed that the meeting was a boisterous affair with three cheers for Mr. Smith being called for at the close of the meeting.[39] The Club received criticism concerning this meeting, particularly from the Conservative Party leadership. In September 1966, a letter was sent from Paul Williams, Patrick Wall and John Biggs-Davison to Edward Heath. It was denied that the public meeting on Rhodesia called for three cheers for Ian Smith. In addition, the letter addressed a concern previously expressed by Heath over the Club's racialist attitude. This was denied by the aforementioned members of the Club, stating that a Club pamphlet Immigration into the UK produced in January 1965, recommended the recruitment of more 'coloured people' to the police.[40]

As well as the Club's concern with Rhodesia, at this time the Club issued a statement for the 1966 General Election.[41] It called for the Conservative Party to fight the election on three issues. Firstly it called for an attack on socialism; secondly, it called for a settlement with Rhodesia and the scrapping of sanctions. Thirdly, it called for an attack on the

---

39. The Times, February 4th 1966, p.10.

40. DPW/40/5, draft letter sent to Heath, 30th September 1966.

41. CPA CCO 20/43/1, 10th March 1966.

Wilson Government and the promotion of a Conservative society.[42] The Conservatives were defeated for the second time in two years by Labour which convinced the Conservative Party that the changes that had begun should be taken forward.

Despite the increase in the Club's membership, numbers were still a concern. The Club stated in the minutes of the Club's Executive Council in October 1966 that membership was lacking in the constituencies.[43] In addition, the Club was determined to increase its influence within the Conservative Party and at grass roots level. In the Club's Executive Council meeting the following month, a decision was made to set up an Action Fund, its "aim...to create a permanent organisation for the Monday Club."[44] The target set was to raise £100,000 in order for the Club to embark on activities throughout the country.[45]

The following year, John Biggs-Davison suggested that the Club undergo re-organisation in order to make it more effective. He recommended that five advisers be appointed to chair groups on key subjects. The groups were the Politics and Parliament group (which

---

42. Ibid.

43. DPW/40/5, minutes of Executive Council meeting, 17th October 1966.

44. DPW/40/6, minutes of Executive Council meeting, 2nd November 1966.

45. Walker, op. cit., p.119. Also see: Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.13.

he suggested should be chaired by an MP), the Administration group, the Editorial group, the Constitution group and the University group. Biggs-Davison also suggested that inactive study groups be dissolved and the Rhodesian Emergency Committee be merged with the African Committee. These recommendations were deferred, but later approved by the Club's Executive Council on 3rd July 1967. Biggs-Davison was appointed the political adviser (Chairman of the politics group) at this point. With the Club's wish to expand and make an impact in the political arena came a written plea to all members from the Director of the Club, Frederick Stockwell, to form more local branches.[46] By the end of that year, University Branches had been established in Exeter, Cambridge, York, Lancaster, Southampton, Oxford, Edinburgh, Kent and Durham. In addition, the first Monday Club University Conference was held in November 1967.[47]

By 1968, the Monday Club had became more active and more visible by arranging a number of rallies on a variety of subjects. Robert Copping in The Story of The Monday Club, states that the Club "was to the fore in initiating Conservative meetings in Trafalgar Square, which had hitherto been largely monopolised by leftist organisations."[48] The first rally focused on the economy (held in February). Socialism came under attack at a rally

---

46. DPW/40/6, minutes of Executive Council meeting, July 1967.

47. DPW/40/6.

48. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.11.

titled, "The Great Betrayal", held at Caxton Hall, in April that year, under the slogan of "Sack Socialism Save Britain."[49]

That same year, the Club embarked on a campaign against the BBC. In February, an article printed in the Sunday Express claimed that the Club had accused the BBC of left-wing bias. In a draft booklet it had produced on the BBC's coverage of African Affairs, the Club accused the BBC of spreading "communist propaganda." Even in the production of the news, it viewed the BBC as having a left-wing bias. In addition, the Club commented on some BBC entertainment programmes, such as "'Til death us do part." The Club was highly critical of the ridiculing of the character of Alf Garnet who had strong patriotic and pro-monarchist views.[50] Here we see the pertinence of Freeden's conception of what is Conservatism. By focussing on patriotism and the monarchy, the Club is seeking to defend the unwilled social order.

Also in 1968, the Monday Club began producing Monday World. This new publication focussed on more theoretical subjects than the Club's Newsletter, or, as it has been

---

49. DPW/40/7.

50. DPW/40/55, draft booklet, February 1968, pp.13-14. Later reported on in: Sunday Express, April 1968.

described, it contained "advanced right-wing nationalist and racialist ideas".[51] There were articles in Monday World that examined and exhibited sympathy with more extreme strands of the right that could be termed radical right. For example, during the early 1970s the publication contained some articles propounding the views of anti-democratic thinkers. The writers that were drawn on were European Catholic authoritarians. Hence, it would appear that there was an attempt to import foreign radical right thought into a movement which prided itself on being British and aligned to economic liberalism.[52] For example, Monday World, Summer 1970, carried an article titled "The Anarchical Order of Power." The author, Ronald King, defended elitism as he viewed it as being in the best interest of the public. He argued that Britain already had a type of 'permanent' government namely the civil service, which was rarely affected by the struggle for power by the political parties.[53] King claimed, "Government is too important to be left to democracy: the structure of our Government with the offices of Prime Minister and Ministers ought to be abolished in favour of the 'permanent' government."[54]

---

51. Evans and Taylor, op. cit., p.171.

52. DPW/40/8, draft proposals for discussion, 27th January 1969.

53. Monday World, Summer 1970, p.13.

54. Ibid., p.15.

The following edition of Monday World carried another article by Ronald King, "Remembering Dr. Salazar", in which the author wrote favourably about the former Portuguese dictator. Dr. Antonio de Oliveira Salazar was a Catholic anti-parliamentarian and anti-liberal. For many, Salazar was a dictator who presided over a "para-fascist regime"[55]; however, for King, Salazar was a "successful statesman" whose rule "was never fascist".[56]

Likewise, in the Summer edition of Monday World, an article appeared by Tom Beardson on the French thinker Charles Maurras and integral nationalism. Maurras, a French anti-republican and corporatist, was a key figure in the Continental radical right before fascism. He favoured an organised economy to bring workers together under the rule of the King. Maurras wanted an alternative social system to socialism and liberal democracy, thereby he favoured corporations which would regulate their own sphere of interest. These spheres, he held, would inevitably be subordinate to the national body and a theory of authoritarian conservatism coupled with a theory of economic nationalism was needed. Beardson essentially agreed and argued that "To Maurras, Right wing thought will be indebted for decades" [57]

---

55. Roger Griffen (ed.), Fascism, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, p.192.

56. Monday World, Autumn 1970, p.12.

57. Ibid., p.7.

Both the article on Maurras and the article titled "The anarchical Order of Power" were examined, shortly after, in the anti-racist publication, Patterns of Prejudice. It was suggested that King's article was essentially anti-democratic and was inspired by Mussolini, whereby society had rulers and the ruled.[58] Beardson was criticised as "He remarkably manages to discuss Maurras without as much as once mentioning his obsession with 'the Jews'."[59] Maurras' group, Action Francaise, was described in Patterns of Prejudice as "The first political grouping of any influence or intellectual status to bear unmistakably fascist traits...Action Francaise should be called early fascism and from certain points of view it is even more closely akin to National Socialism than to Italian Fascism."[60]

However, the alleged links between the Club and Maurras were responded to in a letter to Patterns of Prejudice by the editors of Monday World, Adrian Fitzgerald and David Levy (a Lecturer in Philosophy). They argued that the inclusion of the article on Maurras was in no way a suggestion that the Club agreed with his doctrine. Rather it was meant as a critical insight into the dynamics of democracy. In addition, the article in Patterns of Prejudice, as we have seen, cited Maurras' anti-Semitism, but Fitzgerald and Levy argued that Maurras' anti-Semitism was not the main issue in his work and even with its

---

58. Patterns of Prejudice, September/October 1970, p.24-25.

59. Ibid., pp.7-8.

60. Ibid., p.25.

inclusion it did not detract from his studies on corporatism. To support this, the editors stated that Monday World was opposed to any racist doctrine.[61]

The main focus for the Club and indeed for the political arena in 1968 was Enoch Powell's speech in April that year, on immigration (which will be examined more closely in chapter four). In response, the Monday Club declared its support for Powell despite the condemnation he received elsewhere. The Monday Club's support for Powell continued and consequently, it invited him to dinners and meetings. At one such meeting on 20th November 1968, Powell's address focused on freedom of speech, but he also declared that the Monday Club brought people into the Conservative Party who otherwise might not join.[62] The Club wanted Powell to speak at it's rally the Friday Night of the 1968 Party Conference, but he declined, in part because he was "determined not to be seen as leader of an organised faction".[63]

By the end of 1968, the Club was receiving attention in the press as well as attention within the Conservative Party. An article in The Times by Julian Critchley, MP asked

---

61. Patterns of Prejudice, May/June 1972, p.27.

62. CPA CCO 20/43/4, speech by Powell to the Monday Club, 20th November 1968.

63. Simon Heffer, Like The Roman: The Life of Enoch Powell, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1998, p.479.

"What are we to make of the Monday Club?". He declared that the Club had tried to influence Conservative Party publications, and as a result of its increased membership, it was now trying to influence candidates' selection.[64] This comment had some significance the following year, when the Club was embroiled in a scandal involving the Conservative MP for Surbiton, Nigel Fisher. As we shall discuss in chapter four, the incident involved Club members attempting to oust Fisher, which proved to be a major embarrassment to the Club. However, the Club attempted to limit the damage by inviting Alec Douglas Home to be the guest speaker at the Club's Annual Dinner in November 1969. The Club claimed this was good publicity in the wake of the Fisher scandal.[65]

The following year, at the Club's AGM, the Chairman, Paul Williams, stated that the Club's membership had increased by 90% and had now exceeded 1,500. He also claimed that there were, at that time, 30 Monday Club local branches throughout Britain.[66]

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Monday Club continued to attract media attention for the wrong reasons, due to its alleged links with the extreme right. The Nottingham Evening Post, for instance, carried an article titled "Monday Club lure to fascists", while the East Midlands Young Conservative Chairman, Peter Le Bosquet, appealed for the

---

64. The Times, 23rd November 1968.

65. CPA CCO 20/43/4, 25th November 1969.

66. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.13.

Conservative Party to fight off the Monday Club and other extreme groups.[67]

In the late 1960s there was a feeling on the Right that Britain was falling apart. The Club encapsulated this and the Club like others were fighting against the collapse of the British spirit. This sentiment was echoed in one particular Club publication, Right Angle written by Geoffrey Rippon, in 1969. He declared that "The principal object of the Conservative Party must be to end the present disillusion with politics and politicians and turn the tide of moral and social decay that is sweeping the nation."[68] The blame as far as Rippon was concerned lay firmly with socialism as it had made Government too large and it had taken away individual freedom and choice. Rippon called for a new approach to government, whereby the "centralisation of power in Whitehall" would be reduced.[69] Likewise in the Club's Newsletter, March 1970, a letter sent by the Club to the Conservative Party Chairman, Anthony Barber, declared that it wanted a reduction in State intervention except in the areas of ""industrial democracy and the police". It called for the "central government" to be "strengthened" in these two areas.[70]

---

67. DPW/40/8, Nottingham Evening Post, 18th April 1969.

68. Geoffrey Rippon, Right Angle, London: Monday Club, 1969, p.5.

69. Ibid., p.9.

70. Monday Club Newsletter, March 1970, p.3.

With regard to social and domestic matters, law and order was a key issue for the Club, with it frequently calling for changes in the criminal justice system. Thus, taking a Combative Tory stance, the Club believed that "the Citizen should have maximum effective protection from the increasing amount of crime" and that punishment should be more severe and thus be a more effective deterrent.[71] The Club was also concerned, as were other groups on the Right about moral decline in Britain. In its policy aims it was highly critical of what it saw as the proliferation of pornography in society. It was the Club's view that all written, visual and spoken pornography "corrupts the moral welfare of the nation."[72] The Club's concern on pornography resulted in it establishing a sub-group on the issue.[73]

In May 1970, James Callaghan, the Labour Home Secretary, took the decision to ban a planned South African cricket tour. There had been strong opposition to allowing South Africans to enter Britain for sporting events which had begun in 1968 with demonstrations against the South African rugby tour by the newly formed Anti-Apartheid Movement. The wave of antagonism against the South African sports teams had begun with the decision by the South African Prime Minister, John Vorster, to ban the English

---

71. The Aims of the Monday Club, London: Monday Club, 1967, p.4.

72. Ibid.

73. Monday News, November/December 1973, p.3.

cricket team from visiting South Africa in 1968 because England had selected the black cricketer Basil D'Olivera to play. Callaghan's decision was commented on by the Club who felt the Government was wrong to ban the South African cricketers, claiming that Callaghan had simply succumbed to public pressure and the threat of disruption by some left-wing students. In The Times, an article on Monday Club students contained a comment by their Chairman, Graham Webster-Gardiner, that "The threats of disruption will have defeated democracy."[74] The Monday Club attempted to counteract the 'stop the seventies tour' campaign by forming a 'support the seventies tour' Committee in 1970. The Club's 1970 May Day rally was held in direct response to the stop the seventies tour campaign.[75] The rally, described as the "Monday Club National Freedom Rally", was held in Trafalgar Square and its purpose was to call for politics to be kept out of sport. Julian Amery, Ronald Bell, John Biggs-Davison, Victor Goodhew, Patrick Wall and Stephen Hastings were all speakers at the rally. The Club was also involved in supporting the 1970 South African Rugby Tour.[76]

In the approach to the 1970 General Election, the Monday Club held a number of conferences to gain media exposure. The first conference, held in June 1969, was on

---

74. The Times, 22nd May 1970, p.4.

75. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.18.

76. DPW/40/10, minutes of Executive Council meeting, 3rd May 1970.

subversion in the media. A conference on economics was held just before the Conservative Party Conference that year. The Club ensured that bookshops in Brighton received Monday Club literature to sell during the Conference. In addition, fringe meetings were held at the Party Conference, and there was a call by the Club's Executive for maximum publicity for these meetings.[77]

With the advent of the 1970 General Election campaign the Conservative Party issued its manifesto A Better Tomorrow, which declared its rejection of wage controls and incomes policies. The Club too produced a policy statement for the General Election. Initially it was issued to Club members only along with a memo which stated "The Monday Club's objective is to persuade the Conservative Party to adopt radical and forward-looking policies."[78] There was also an appeal for members to be active at all levels of the Party. The Club's policies were then published in a pamphlet titled The New Battle of Britain.[79] The policies it urged the Conservative Party to adopt should it be returned to Government included; reduced Government expenditure, reduced taxation, and immediate denationalisation, thus encapsulating an economic liberal stance. Taking a Combative

---

77. DPW/40/9, rallies held on: Media; 23rd June 1969; Economics 4th October 1969; Housing 15th November 1969, as well as the Conservative Party Conference in Brighton on 10th October 1969.

78. DPW/40/9, Monday Club policy statement for 1970 General Election.

79. The New Battle of Britain, London: The Monday Club, 1970, pp.1-2.

Tory approach, the pamphlet also called for the reform of the Welfare State whereby, only those in real need should receive benefits, others, it argued should be encouraged to become self reliant. Not surprisingly, the pamphlet outlined the Club's view on immigration, that immigration should be reduced and a voluntary repatriation scheme should be established.[80] The 1970 General Election returned a Conservative Government to power, with Edward Heath becoming the new Prime Minister. Initially the Monday Club was enthusiastic about the new Government; however, as will be discussed later, this was short lived.

One of the reasons for the Club's enthusiasm towards Heath was his support for the sale of arms to South Africa. (In 1963 a UN resolution had banned the supply of weapons to South Africa). Heath's pledge to supply arms to South Africa for external use, in particular to defend the sea routes around the Cape, was declared to the House of Commons on 19th December 1967 whilst he was leader of the Opposition.[81] The Club fully supported Heath's stance. With the return of a Conservative Government under Heath in 1970, it expressed its hope that the Government would lift the arms embargo on South Africa and it also declared that it would exert pressure on the Government to

---

80. Ibid.

81. Monday Club Newsletter, October/November 1970, p.5.

ensure that this came about.[82] The Club's support for the South African regime was radical right in the belief that it was "a bastion against the final take-over of the entire African continent by the agents of international communism."[83]

With regard to the Club's membership at this stage, Seyd in his article on the Monday Club suggested that the Club's membership in 1970 was between 1,600 to 2,500. He based his estimate on the annual subscriptions collected in 1970.[84] However, the Club claimed at this time that it had 23 regional branches, 50 University and HE institute branches, and 5,000 members.[85] With the Club's overall increase in membership came an increase in MP support, from 16 to 30 MPs (6 of whom were part of the Heath Cabinet). The possible reason for this, as suggested by Gerald Howarth, was the stance taken by the Club on Rhodesia, Howarth argues that there were many MPs sympathetic to the Club's call for the lifting of Rhodesian sanctions.[86]

---

82. Monday Club Newsletter, April 1970, p.7.

83. Guardian of the Tory Conscience, London: Monday Club, 1981, p.8.

84. Seyd, op. cit., p.470.

85. DPW/40/10.

86. Interview with Gerald Howarth, 29th April 1998.

By 1971, the Monday Club's local branches had increased to 30, and 55 groups had been established in universities and colleges. Membership had allegedly risen to 10,000, including 35 MPs. These included Paul Williams, Julian Amery (who was in Heath's cabinet as a Minister in the Department of Environment and then the Foreign Office), John Peyton, who was a Monday Club member prior to the 1970 General Election (Minister under Heath at the Department of Environment), Geoffrey Rippon (who was a Minister at the Department of Technology and later became Britain's negotiator for EEC entry and the Ugandan Asian Crisis), Teddy Taylor (who resigned from his post as junior Minister for Scotland over Britain's entry to the EEC), Ronald Bell, Harold Gurden, John Biggs-Davison (who became Chairman of the Conservative Parliamentary Northern Ireland Committee in November 1974 and was also Club spokesman on Northern Ireland)[87], Stephen Hastings, Victor Goodhew, W.H. Barker, J. Hiley, Jasper Moore, Jill Knight, Patrick Wall, M. Woodnutt, Anthony Wiggen, who, along with Rippon and Amery were all members of the Club and MPs before the 1970 General Election. Monday Club members who successfully took seats at the 1970 General Election were Geoffrey Stewart Smith, Patrick Cormack, Anthony Fell, R. Boscowan, Harold Soref, William Benyon, R. White, Peter Rost, Norman Tebbitt, Piers Dixon, D. James. Sitting MPs whom later joined the Club were Sir Stephen McAdden, Richard Body, John Stokes,

---

87. Robert Copping, The Monday Club – Crisis and After, WestCliff-on-Sea: Current Affairs Information Service, 1975, p.20.

R. Russell, and Richard Taylor.[88] Biggs-Davison, when addressing a Club conference in October 1971, declared, optimistically, that the Club was "one of the great forces in British politics".[89] The Club now regarded itself in a position to exert pressure on the Conservative Party. One member was quoted as saying "We are now able to bring pressure to bear in a number of constituencies where members' ideas conflict with those of true conservatism. Within 10 years we, the Party's tail shall wag the dog."[90]

As well as a change in the structure of the Club from 1965, there was also a shift in the focus of its policies. When the Club was established in 1961 it concentrated on the relinquishing of the Empire. After 1965, apart from the obvious support for Ian Smith in Rhodesia, the Club focused on domestic issues. At the Chairman's Annual Review in April 1971, the Club's then Chairman, George Pole, announced the Club's goals. He declared that its policies focused on "genuine economic freedom and competition with particular encouragement to small businesses, lower taxation through reduction in

---

88. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.21.

89. Speech by John Biggs-Davison at Conservative Party Conference 2nd October 1971; Seyd, op. cit., p.472.

90. Daily Mirror, 15th March 1971, cited in Michaels, op. cit., p.15.

government expenditure so as to leave the individual free to provide for his own and family needs, effective financial provision for the really needy, cessation of immigration, trade union reform which includes the sharing of responsibilities by management and workers alike, and the preservation of freedom through respect and enforcement of the law."[91] Here we can see, as noted earlier, the notion of the Club adopting the New Right stance as defined by Gamble. Other goals focused on defence, subversion, and morality.[92]

The Monday Club's hard line, particularly on race and immigration, led to it being linked with the extreme right. This was indicated when it held rallies in the early 1970s which were supported by the National Front, one of which was the Monday Club May Day rally on law and order in 1970.[93] More damaging incidents involved activities at Monday Club branch level. The Essex Monday Club branch was expelled in 1973, when it invited the Chairman of the NF, John Tyndall, to address one of its meetings. The West Middlesex branch of the Club was also drawn into controversy when it campaigned for the NF candidate at the Uxbridge by-election in December 1972.[94] Later, Martin Webster, a

---

91. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.10.

92. DPW/40/11.

93. Walker, op. cit., p.119.

94. Ibid., p.125.

leading figure in the NF[95], who had originally denied there had been a 'strategy' to infiltrate the Club,[96] admitted it to a journalist.[97] At the time, a notable example of the Club's more extremist element was when the Chairman of the Sussex Branch of the Club, John Ormowe, was forced to resign after he told the Daily Mirror; "I accept I am a racialist. If you read Mein Kampf you will see it has been wrongly derided. I personally am an admirer of Hitler...I doubt whether he knew about all those people who were cremated."[98]

In August 1972, Britain was faced with a crisis, when the Ugandan President, Idi Amin, announced that Asians, who were not Ugandan citizens, had to leave the country. Uganda was a former British colony and had gained independence in 1962. At that time it had been agreed that those who had been born in Uganda and had at least one parent born in Uganda could qualify for Ugandan nationality. The Heath Government accepted that Asians would not come under this qualification, thus it was agreed that they should keep their UK nationality and would consequently be entitled to British passports. Hence, Britain had a legal and moral obligation to accept these people.

---

95. Durham, op.cit., p.83.

96. Ibid., pp.91-92.

97. Ibid., p.93.

98. Walker, op. cit., p.125.

In October 1972, a letter was sent to members from the Club Chairman, Jonathan Guinness (an investment banker and son of Lord Moyne), concerning the call by some members for Geoffrey Rippon's resignation due to his involvement in the Ugandan Asian Crisis (Rippon was the Minister who conducted negotiations with Uganda regarding the expulsion of the Asians). Those who had called for Rippon's resignation were reportedly "sacked" from the Club during the Conservative Party Conference that year.[99] A special meeting was held shortly after because members had requested it. The Club had been formally against accepting the Asians, but Guinness did state that Rippon was allowed to hold a different view and also that he was bound by ministerial responsibility.[100]

In direct response to the Ugandan Asian Crisis, the Club held a rally in the Central Hall, Westminster, which was stewarded by NF members. This rally heralded the start of the Club's 'Halt Immigration Now Campaign' (HINC). In a letter to all members, in March 1973, Ronald Bell attempted to clarify the purpose of the HINC. He stated that "Last Autumn the Club launched a campaign to stop tropical immigration into the UK and to call for a real assisted repatriation programme and the repeal of the Race Relations Act." As will be shown in chapter four, the HINC was a major part of the Monday Club's

---

99. The Times, 16th October 1972, p.12.

100. DPW/40/47, minutes meeting, 10th October 1972.

operations in the early 1970s and illustrates the notion of the Monday Club being classified as radical right. However, it drew the Club into further controversy.[101]

As well as the negative attention from the media, the Club received hostility from other Conservative groups, such as Pressure for Economic and Social Toryism (PEST), a 'liberal' Tory group, which criticised the Monday Club on a number of issues. It claimed that if the Monday Club ever succeeded in influencing Conservative Party policy, the Party would never form a Government. This followed the Club's suggestion that the Bank of England should be denationalised: "To talk of denationalising the Bank of England is absurd and impossible. This policy if pursued – for pursue is the word, as it could never be implemented – would lead to industrial chaos and national bankruptcy."[102]

At the end of March 1973, George Kennedy Young (former Deputy Director of MI6) announced his decision to stand as Chairman of the Club. Its then Chairman, Jonathan Guinness, expressed his concern at Young standing in a letter to the Daily Telegraph, suggesting that those branches and members who had been expelled by the Club, due to alleged infiltration by the far right, would probably be admitted back to the Club if G.K.Young was to win the leadership contest.[103]

---

101. DPW/40/12, 16th September 1972, and letter from Ronald Bell, 26th March 1973.

102. The Times, 19th September 1972, p.2.

103. Daily Telegraph, 4th April 1973.

In the same edition of the Daily Telegraph, a letter by John Biggs-Davison, Patrick Wall and Harold Soref was printed. The letter criticised the treatment Guinness had received from Club members who were acting in a way to discredit him by leaking confidential information from the Club's Executive Council meetings. They also expressed their concern for the Club's future: "We are not prepared to see the Monday Club which we have served for more than a decade become the plaything of extremist and political freaks."[104]

There was a number of claims in the press regarding alleged leaked or forged documents, to such an extent that police investigated a letter sent to Monday Club members supposedly written by Guinness. The letter, which asked for members to vote for Guinness in the forthcoming Chairman elections, was proved a forgery.[105] The letter apparently "asks for votes for Mr Guinness" and in Guinness's words was "designed to present my alleged views in as unattractive a light as possible." According to the Club's Director, Michael Woolrych, the production of the letter was "an inside job."[106]

---

104. Ibid.

105. Wolverhampton Express and Star, 9th April 1973.

106. Ibid.

With the media focussing on the leadership battle, the exchange of letters in the press continued, usually members replying to other members, and comments on the characters and the politics of the two contenders. The media also looked at the possible consequences of either Young or Guinness winning the leadership contest. It was suggested that if Young were to win the contest, it would be likely that the MPs, particularly Julian Amery and Geoffrey Rippon, would resign from the Club. In addition, it was suggested that Young's victory would result in increased NF infiltration. Criticism levelled at Guinness centred on his eccentricities following his campaign in the Lincoln by-election where he was the Conservative Party candidate, in which he claimed he supported prisoners being given razor blades so they could commit suicide.[107]

It was commented in the Financial Times that those members who supported Young were from the extreme elements in the Club such as NF members and former members of the Anglo-Rhodesian Society who, it was claimed, had infiltrated branches. It was also suggested that the problems within the Club had begun many years previous, when the Monday Club "became the chief weapon of the Anglo-Rhodesian lobby." The article continued by declaring that K.Harvey Proctor was to forward a proposal for all Club members to be members of the Conservative Party, thereby, he argued, ensuring that the member was a genuine supporter of Conservative policies.[108]

---

107. Doncaster Evening Post, 6th April 1973 and Daily Telegraph, 16th April 1973.

108. Financial Times, 13th April 1973.

It was also suggested in the Observer that the problem with the Club had begun when the local branches were established, which meant that the Club's Executive did not have proper control over the membership. It was acknowledged that local branch members were not allowed to influence Club policy. However, the article suggested that as the local branches had allowed extreme members into the Club, it was seen as having an extremist and often anti-immigration reputation.[109]

Criticisms of Guinness came from the excluded Essex branch Chairman, Len Lambert. He argued that Guinness's beliefs on capital punishment were far more damaging to the Monday Club than Lambert's own branch inviting the NF to talk at its branch meeting. He continued to argue that the branch practised an open forum, whereby a variety of groups were invited to speak to the branch. The principal reason for inviting the NF to speak, he declared, was its relative success at the West Bromwich by-election; there was the suggestion at the time that it could prove to be a serious political force. He continued by arguing that Jonathan Guinness had ruled the Monday Club with an "authoritarian dictatorship."[110]

In a similar way to Lambert, the Worthing Branch of the Monday Club used the publicity from the leadership contest to deny accusations that it had been infiltrated by the NF. The

---

109. Observer, 29th April 1973.

110. Daily Telegraph, 16th April 1973.

Club Secretary, Mr E.G Curphey, issued a press statement in the Worthing Herald in April 1973, which defended the Branch's position on inviting NF members to talk to the Branch, "...we remain part of the Conservative Party – a pressure group & not a subversive group. Socialists have visited the Worthing Club and have expressed their views and like members of the National Front and Liberal Party who have attended our meetings, we have never regarded any person as persona non grata nor as an infiltrator."[111] The previous month the Worthing Herald carried a report that focussed on alleged infiltration of the Monday Club by the NF, whereby it was claimed by Oliver Gilbert, a NF member that, "every Monday Club branch had been infiltrated by National Front members".[112]

In the Daily Telegraph in April, a letter from another Club member, Michael Orme, was published which focused on Young's support for Powell's immigration policy and in addition, his alleged support for compulsory repatriation. The letter was highly critical of Young and called for him to come out and make his views on immigration precisely clear.[113] He pursued the issue in a further letter to the Daily Telegraph two weeks later,

---

111. Worthing Herald, 6th April 1973.

112. Worthing Herald, 30th March 1973 cited by Durham, op. cit., p.93.

113. Daily Telegraph, 9th April 1973.

following a reply by Young.[114] In the reply Young had avoided the question of his views on repatriation. Hence, Orme called for him to state "whether or not he favours... compulsory repatriation."[115]

In the Sunday Times, an article, "Schism on the Right", predicted the downfall of the Monday Club because of the leadership battle and the alleged infiltration by the NF. It was reported that the Club had made an effort to rid itself of any such members by employing an investigator by the name of Leslie Wooler. (This occurred before Guinness was first elected Chairman). Wooler had succeeded in identifying 12 Club members who were allegedly NF members. This was a covert operation, as it only became known when a list of NF members was found at the Club's HQ.[116] It was later revealed at a Club Executive meeting; the Executive claimed it did not know about this. Wooler, in response to the expose, replied, that as he was anti–racist; he had no problem with attempting to expose those within the Club who aligned themselves to the NF.[117]

The result of the leadership challenge was a victory for Jonathan Guinness; this consequently led to Young's resignation. In the wake of the election, Guinness embarked

---

114. Daily Telegraph, 16th April 1973, G. K.Young's letter.

115. Daily Telegraph, 21st April 1973.

116. Sunday Times, 22nd April 1973.

117. Sunday Times, 29th April 1973.

on a programme to rid the Club of what he saw as its disruptive tendencies and thus warned of expulsion for those "...who have deliberately stirred up controversy and trouble over the past year."[118] The action was less covert on this occasion. At the Club's annual conference on April 30th it called for a restriction of membership to those who were members of the Conservative and Unionists Association.

Members resigned as a result of the in-fighting and the election result. John Biggs-Davison expressed his wish to resign; however, Michael Woolrych persuaded him not to.[119] One of the other key members to offer his resignation was Sam Swerling. In his resignation letter sent to Patrick Wall, Swerling stated, "the question of press publicity has been the telling factor in the decline of the fortunes of the Monday Club." Regarding the disagreements, Swerling attested that "the Monday Club has ceased to provide any really worthwhile ideas for the benefit of the Conservative Party in the last two years."[120] In response to Swerling's letter, Wall replied, "I only hope that the rot in the Monday Club has not gone so deep as to make it completely ineffective. However, I have my doubts and certainly do not believe it can survive under the present Chairman... Young was the person who was really dangerous... due to his obsession over immigration." He

---

118. "Exit the Reluctant Hero", Economist, 5th May 1974, pp.24-25.

119. DPW/40/13, letter to Patrick Wall from John Biggs-Davison, 31st June 1973.

120. DPW/40/13, letter to Patrick Wall from Sam Swerling, 25th June 1973.

continued, "I haven't got very much hope for the future of the Monday Club."[121] Swerling did not resign at this stage and indeed, became Chairman in 1980.

The conclusion to the leadership contest did little to bring together the separate factions within the Club and soon after Guinness's victory, certain members of the Club were calling for his resignation. A rebel group within the Club, in July 1973, held a meeting, which called "...upon the Chairman, the Honourable Jonathan Guinness, to step down from the Chairmanship of the Club."[122] Guinness refused to accept the meeting's decision and remained Chairman. The rebel group within the Club even considered forming a 'Tuesday Club' to act as a far right alternative to the Monday Club. This idea was abandoned as it was felt that that it defeated the object of trying to oust Guinness from the Chairmanship of the Club.[123]

Consequently, a further special AGM was held in the September. Prior to this meeting the rebel group issued a pamphlet "Monday Club – a survey of events" which was published

---

121. DPW/40/13, letter to Sam Swerling from Patrick Wall, 8th August 1973.

122. DPW/40/13.

123. Economist, 25th August 1973, p.24.

to deny the allegations made in the media.[124] In addition the pamphlet claimed "to establish objectively the facts of what happened", giving the full story of the events of that year leading up to the leadership challenge and after.[125] At the meeting, all but 54 of the 300 members present called for Guinness to resign. In addition, the meeting called for the rejoining of all members who had left in the previous four months and that the Club's activities be suspended for 3 to 4 months; the motion was passed.[126] More resignations and expulsions followed; however, Guinness remained resolute in his position as Chairman.[127]

Not surprisingly the Monday Club's in-fighting and incidents of infiltration by extremists led to it being regarded as a spent force by members of the Club, as well as media and political commentators. David Edgar in "Bitter Harvest," commented that following the leadership battle, "the Club faded from view", having undergone a "messy collapse."[128] For many Conservatives the Club no longer represented the respectable radical right; hence, by August 1973, the number of MPs within the Club had fallen to 16, key

---

124. DPW/40/13, "Monday Club – a survey of events", 1973, p.5.

125. Ibid., p.1.

126. Copping, 1975, op. cit., p.9.

127. Economist, 25th August, pp.24-25.

128. Edgar, 1984, op. cit., p.41.

members such as Ronald Bell and Geoffrey Baber resigned.[129] Those MPs who remained in the Club included: Julian Amery, Jonathan Biggs-Davison, Alan Clarke, Harold Gurden, Anthony Fell, Jill Knight, Ivan Lawrence, James Molyneaux, Jasper More, Peter Rost, Edward Taylor, Robert Taylor, Patrick Wall, plus three 'silent' members, who did not want their name publicly linked to the Club.[130]

Despite the problems the Club had experienced, in late September 1973 it attempted to re-establish the Action Fund and to recommence political activity.[131] By 1974, it attempted to carry on in a 'business as usual' fashion. It held meetings on a variety of subjects ranging from communism to education. In April 1974, John Biggs-Davison became Chairman of the Club.[132]

By 1975, the Monday Club undertook a recruitment drive and a campaign to attract more funds. The Club established a strategy sub-committee, which forwarded a motion to "recruit a fellow conservative and win a prize". This motion was carried, which meant for every member recruited a free raffle ticket was given for a Fortnum and Mason Christmas Hamper. Other suggestions to raise funds included a request for donations, a draft letter

---

129. Economist, 4th August 1973, p.22.

130. Seyd, op. cit., p.471 and DPW/40/14, list of Monday Club MPs.

131. DPW/40/13.

132. DPW/40/14, 18th February 1974 and 20th May 1974.

to ex-members requesting that they rejoin, and a letter to be sent to anyone who had written a 'sensible' letter to the press. Decisions was made to include more adverts for new members in the Daily Telegraph and Sunday Times, a room to be booked for every day of the Conservative Party Conference to hold fringe meetings and to invite guest speakers for these fringe meetings.[133]

By 1976 the Monday Club had produced the Club's manifesto and a public meeting on Rhodesia was held. However, there was a concern amongst the Club that there was a lack of publicity. Patrick Wall suggested that in order to attract publicity, the Club should recruit more MPs.[134] In addition, the Club produced two new publications, Tory Challenge, a quarterly publication, and Monday News, a monthly publication that replaced the Club's Newsletter (Monday World continued to be published).[135]

The appointment of Mrs Thatcher as Heath's successor as Conservative Party leader meant that the Club (and other right wing groups) now had a Party leader who would formulate right wing policies they had long been advocating. The Monday Club had supported her during the election as Party leader in 1975. Thatcher's views on the Club were included in a report sent to all Club members in 1976 from its then Chairman Sir

---

133. DPW/40/15.

134. DPW/40/16, 16th March 1976.

135. Searchlight, September 1976, p.9.

Victor Raikes; "I send my very best wishes to the branches of the Monday Club. It is only right that our Party should maintain a good-natured yet serious debate within its ranks on matters of policy. The Monday Club has always played a most useful role on defending traditional Conservative values and I hope it will continue to do so."[136]

In early 1977 there was obvious disillusionment within the Club with regard to its future. In a letter to Victor Raikes from Sam Swerling, it was stated that "The Monday Club is no nearer to putting itself in the forefront of Conservative politics than it was two years ago."[137] Consequently, a letter from a sub-committee Chairman, William Perry, was sent to all Club members stating, "We wish to launch the Club on a programme of major nation-wide expansion. For this we need money."[138] Later that same year, recruitment was firmly on the minds of the Club's Executive. A notice to all members was sent in September asking what type of new members it wished to attract. It also asked for suggestions as to how should it attract members, putting forward suggestions, such as adverts, circulation of literature, trial membership, reduced subscriptions, improved policies, structure and propaganda.[139] In addition, in order to publicise the Club's

---

136. DPW/40/54 and letter from Mrs. Thatcher, 3rd May 1976; The Party Leadership and The Monday Club, London: Monday Club, 1976, p.2.

137. DPW/40/16, 27th January 1977.

138. DPW/40/18, 11th February 1977.

139. DPW/40/18, 14th September 1977.

policies, a number of fact sheets were produced in 1978/9. These included sheets on Defence, Africa, Local Government, Education and Ulster.[140]

The economic problems experienced in Britain in the late 1970s renewed the Club's interest in Economics, with the Monday Club holding a meeting on industrial relations at Caxton Hall on 15th February 1979, titled "Campaign for Industrial Sanity". Following on from this meeting, Patrick Wall sent letters to leading industrialists with an accompanying questionnaire to obtain their views on issues such as picketing and compulsory ballots.[141] A discussion paper was then produced following the meeting and the responses to the questionnaire. Wall claimed that the purpose of this was not because the Monday Club was anti-Trade Unions, rather it was anti-militancy.[142]

The 1979 General Election resulted in Conservative victory. Margaret Thatcher was elected Prime Minister on a manifesto that promised a radical alternative to the previous Labour administration, offering a 'rolling back' of areas of state welfare provision. A few months later, the Club was pursuing a programme of expansion. A paper was produced with Club targets and objectives, which argued that the Club's present membership was too small at 1150, and that it was intended to increase it to 5,000. The proposals put

---

140. DPW/40/58.

141. DPW/40/37, letter from Wall to industrialists, 15th February 1979.

142. DPW/40/37, discussion paper, 5th March 1979.

forward to increase membership were: to increase the quality of its publications; copies of the Club's aims and membership forms to be available at all meetings; every member to recruit one new member; to seek recruits of a higher academic level, such as University students and to keep a monitor of membership numbers.[143]

By August 1979, the Club's membership had increased by 200 and 4 new branches had been established. Patrick Wall had now taken over as Chairman, succeeding Victor Raikes. 13 MPs remained members at this time included Julian Amery, Peter Bottomly, Jill Knight, Ivan Lawrence, James Molyneaux, K. Harvey Proctor, William Ross, Peter Rost, John Stokes and John Biggs-Davison.[144]

Tensions were high within the Club in mid 1979 firstly due to the lack of impact on the Conservative Party and secondly, because of the Club's finances. The Monday Club's future seemed so bleak that the Executive even considered closing it down. This was mentioned in a confidential letter to Wall from Club Executive Officer David Storey: "The Club has really only two options left. 1. To dispose of one if not both officers and abolish the director. 2. Wind up the Club immediately."[145] As neither of these options

---

143. DPW/40/42, 14th May 1979.

144. DPW/40/20, August 1979.

145. DPW/40/33, 29th June 1979.

were acted upon, the Club renewed its call for new members and more media attention.[146]

At this time the Club's Chairman, Patrick Wall, felt that to increase membership the Club needed to focus on Rhodesia and industrial relations. A letter from Wall to David Storey stressed the need for the Club to focus on these two issues. Wall saw this firstly as a way to attract publicity and secondly as a way to attract new members.[147] In a further letter to Storey, Wall stated, "I believe the Club was most effective as far as Zimbabwe-Rhodesia is concerned."[148]

As previously noted, part of the Monday Club's commitment to a strong nation was its stance on law and order. The Club believed that law and order was "fundamental to the stability of society".[149] The Club's Combative Tory stance received most publicity when in October 1980 it launched its campaign for a referendum on the restoration of capital punishment for deliberate acts of murder and terrorism. It was launched by Teddy Taylor, Ivan Lawrence, Graham Mather and W. Walker. The Club also published a petition so it could demonstrate to the Government the public's view on the death penalty.[150]

---

146. DPW/40/35.

147. DPW/40/33.

148. DPW/40/22.

149. Law and Order Policy Paper No.7, London: Monday Club, 1978.

150. Daily Telegraph, 9th October 1980 and The Times, 9th October 1980.

Whilst trying to attract publicity, the Club was criticised for its associations with groups such as the World Anti-Communist League ("a hard line right wing" international organisation, allegedly containing Nazi-sympathisers, anti-Semites and anti-Catholic members[151]) and the Italian neo-fascist party, the MSI. For example, the anti-fascist magazine, Searchlight, commented on Rippon's visit to the leaders of the League. Likewise, Julian Amery was criticised for sharing the platform with the leader of the MSI at a meeting in Brighton.[152]

By 1981, Sam Swerling had become Chairman of the Club. This appointment was not viewed favourably by some members, as some felt that the Club would again attract extremists. In April that year, the Club's president, the Marquis of Salisbury, resigned; he had been the Club's president since it's establishment in 1961. He stated in his resignation letter to Patrick Wall that, "like you I have been concerned at the direction that the management of the Monday Club has taken since Swerling became Chairman...I can no longer stay on as President." Consequently, Wall stated that he would remain a member of the Monday Club; however, he claimed that he would not take part in its activities.[153]

---

151. Searchlight, no. 21, 1976, p.10.

152. Searchlight, April, 1984, p.10.

153. DPW/40/23, 30th April 1981.

With some key members of the Club taking a low profile, some were still keen to attract publicity. However, as Swerling stated at that time, Mrs Thatcher becoming Prime Minister was an own goal for the Club. In his Chairman's report of 1981, he explained that task ahead for the Club "is not nearly so easy to achieve while the Party is in power." This, he claimed, was due to party loyalty and not feeling able to attack your own Government. However, Swerling did criticise Government's economic policies as it had not implemented a policy of denationalisation and criticised its failure to extend restrictions on coloured immigration.[154]

With the inner city riots that ensued in the early 1980s came a renewed interest in the issue of race and immigration. In 1981, a meeting was held at Caxton Hall, Westminster, by WISE (Welsh Irish Scottish English), a right wing nationalist group established in 1974, titled "Immigration and Repatriation - Who goes home?" The principal speaker was Monday Club member K.Harvey Proctor.[155] In addition, that year, Proctor produced a Club paper with the Club's Political Adviser, John Pinniger, focussing on New Commonwealth and Pakistani (NCWP) immigration.

With the Club's emphasis being on the Conservative Party Conference, a report from John Pinniger in October 1981 to all members of the Monday Club referred any queries

---

154. DPW/40/23, 2nd April 1981.

155. DPW/ 40/23, 18th July 1981.

regarding discussions at the Conservative Party Conference to the following individuals: Immigration and repatriation - K.Harvey Proctor; EEC - Teddy Taylor; Trade Unions - Viscount Massereene; Local Government - Miss Eleanor Dodd; South Africa - John Carlisle.[156] Fringe meetings were arranged for the Party Conference, on Northern Ireland and immigration and repatriation.

Despite the invasion of the Falkland Islands by Argentina in April 1982, the Club's concern with overseas affairs was still focussed on Rhodesia (although a meeting was held in November that year specifically on the Falklands).[157]

In the Club's Chairman's report that year, David Storey (who took over as Chairman of the Club from Sam Swerling in 1982) focused on a comment made by Sir Harold Wilson, who had described the Club as "the guardian of the Tory conscience". Storey stated that we "...certainly welcome that one! It epitomises the view which we take of ourselves and it is a concept which lies at the very heart of our existence." He rejected the media's description the 'right wing Monday Club' because he felt that this indicated a deviation from normal politics. He attested that "heart of our philosophy is the supremacy of patriotism."[158]

---

156. DPW/40/24.

157. DPW/40/25.

158. DPW/40/25, Chairman's yearly report, September 1982.

During 1982, the Club maintained its stance in trying to attract members via a membership drive and financial appeal. The Club did manage to attract one MP, ex-member Anthony Marlow, who spoke at a Club fringe meeting at the 1982 Conservative Party Conference.[159]

At the Conservative Party Conference in October 1983, a debate on repatriation was on the agenda, according to the anti-fascist magazine Searchlight, this was due to "intensive lobbying" by the Monday Club. The Billericay Conservative Political Centre (Proctor's constituency) forwarded the motion for such a debate. It succeeded in the ballot in placing the issue on the agenda. However, the debate was not viewed favourably with only 150 out of 4000 delegates voting to hear the debate. The motion which called for an end to all immigration from New Commonwealth countries, was heavily defeated.[160]

Allegations of links between the Club and the extreme right re-emerged again in 1983, when the Conservative Party asked the Young Conservatives to investigate accusations of extremist infiltration in the Party. A consequence of the investigation was the production of a BBC "Panorama" programme in January 1984, in which Conservative MPs, who had been allegedly linked to extreme right wing groups, were named. Amongst those groups

---

159. DPW/40/25, Conservative Party Conference 1982.

160. Searchlight, October 1983, p.6.

mentioned were WISE, Tory Action (a group formed by George Kennedy Young in 1974) and the Monday Club. This led to libel action by some of those named. Gerald Howarth and Neil Hamilton, former members of the Monday Club, successfully sued the BBC over the allegations made against them contained in the programme.[161]

In the wake of the "Panorama" programme, the Club faced further accusations from within its ranks, when John Pinniger (who, as we have noted was the Club's Political Adviser) accused the Club of harbouring extremists and racists.[162] Pinniger, who resigned from the Club in March 1984, claimed his resignation had resulted from the Club allowing people into its ranks who were associated with groups such as WISE and Tory Action. Pinniger argued that his resignation was also due to the appalling treatment by certain Club members of the Club's black Secretary for Race Relations, Derek Laud, whom Pinniger alleged had been subject to "racialist comments...at a Club meeting".[163] (Laud was elected Secretary of the Club's Immigration and Race Relations Committee following his address to a Club fringe meeting at the Conservative Party Conference in 1983. Laud's speech included a call for repatriation. His position within the Club was described by the anti-racist magazine Searchlight, as a "bizarre political alignment"[164]).

---

161. Searchlight, June 1987, p.10.

162. Guardian, 13th March 1984.

163. Guardian, 12th March 1984.

164. Searchlight, December 1983, p.6.

In Pinniger's own words, the Club had "...members who are simply anti-immigration and anti-black – and racist. They want repatriation, voluntary or not."[165] In response, the Club issued a press statement; "Mr Pinniger has been a prominent advocate of the policies he now seeks to label extremist", and the Club circulated a paper, Immigration and Repatriation – Who goes home? written by Pinniger and K.Harvey Proctor advocating repatriation.[166]

In 1984, Searchlight declared that K.Harvey Proctor was the most prominent of racist right Tory MPs since the death of former Monday Club member Ronald Bell in 1982. In the same publication it was suggested that the Monday Club had become "revitalised" since its 'so called' demise in the mid 1970s.[167] This new lease of life, in its opinion, came about with the publication of Proctor's anti-immigration pamphlet in 1981.[168] Under Heath's leadership, Proctor had been excluded from the list of prospective Conservative Parliamentary candidates as Heath felt he was unsuitable. However, Proctor was added to the list in 1981 under Thatcher.[169]

---

165. Guardian, 10th March 1984.

166. Searchlight, June 1989, p.12.

167. Searchlight, January 1984, p.4.

168. Ibid., p.13.

169. Searchlight, January 1982, p.11.

The Club's overt messages of anti-immigration once again aroused the interests of extreme right groups such as the NF. Searchlight carried an article concerning Richard Franklin (a member of a splinter group of the NF) who 'revealed' that there was a 'strategy of infiltration'.[170]

Shortly after John Pinniger's resignation, three other members resigned due to the alleged extremism within the Club. In response to the four resignations, the Club's Executive sought to discredit Pinniger's claims regarding the racist policies and extremist elements within the Club. One of the four members who resigned, Simon McIlwain (Deputy Chairman of the Club's Northern Ireland Group), described the Monday Club as being "authoritarian; degenerate and corrupt."[171] He continued to declare that the Club was "morally and politically bankrupt" due to its links with right wing groups, such as WISE and Tory Action.[172]

Media articles appeared suggesting that John Pinniger and others had established a 'ginger group' within the Club known as the Camberley Group. The Group, allegedly, was heading a plot to take over the Monday Club. According to the Club, it had expelled

---

170. Searchlight, January 1984, p.4.

171. Daily Telegraph, 12th March 1984.

172. Ibid.

Pinniger and those members who were part of the plot.[173] In light of the Pinniger incident, a letter from the Monday Club Executive stated "A major corrective is required to the feverish media activity which has been generated recently by the loquacious former employee of the Monday Club, Mr. John Pinniger."[174] David Storey complained to the Daily Telegraph about the coverage of the Pinniger incident.[175]

Despite the considerable amount of media attention given to the Pinniger allegations and subsequent resignations, the Monday Club appeared relatively unscathed by the incident. In the Club's Chairman's report at the AGM a better financial position was highlighted.[176] However, the Club continued to attract unwanted publicity, particularly with its members being active in other right wing groups, such as the Federation of Conservative Students (FCS) and Western Goals UK (WGUK). WGUK, an anti-Communist organisation, was an offshoot of the American Western Goals Foundation. Members included those from the Monday Club, as well as from FCS and Conservative MPs. This organisation invited speakers from Latin America & South Africa, such as Clive Derby-Lewis (a former adviser to F.W. De Klerk's Government, who broke away

---

173. The Times, 13th March 1984.

174. DPW/40/27, 13th March 1984.

175. DPW/40/27.

176. DPW/40/29, 29th June 1985.

to join the South African Conservative Party and, who was later convicted of the murder of the South African Communist Party leader, Chris Hani[177]) and Robert d'Aubuison (who has been described as an "El Salvador the death squad leader"[178]). Consequently, the Monday Club continued to attract controversy over extremism. In 1985 the Club did consider expelling the Chairman of the Cambridge University branch of the Monday Club, Barry Aylisse, because he was alleged to have said he found blacks "aesthetically obnoxious."[179] However, the Club decided to retain him as Chairman of the Branch stating that "everyone is happy"; The Times felt forced to proclaim that everyone was except black people.[180]

In 1985 the Club's activities focused on race and immigration and economics. It held a one-day conference on "Race relations – the future" at the Westminster Conference Centre, organised by the Club's Immigration and Race Relations Committee.

---

177. For Monday Club and Clive Derby Lewis see: Searchlight, September 1990, p.10. For the conviction of Clive Derby Lewis see: "S.Africa: Amnesty hearing put off for Hani's Killers", www.cnn.com/WORLD/9706/23/south.africa.Hani/

178. Gavin Evans, "Infiltrating the Monday Club", 18th August 1999, p.3 on: www.dailymail&guardian.com/18aug-mondayclub.html

179. The Times, 10th January 1985, p.10.

180. The Times, 13th February 1985, p.12.

Similarly, a conference was also held on economics that year, under the banner "The Government's economic policy – why there is no alternative." Speakers at the conference included Patrick Minford, one of the economic advisers to Margaret Thatcher. Following the Conservative Party Conference that year, Patrick Minford became a Monday Club member. The Club was in a buoyant mood after attracting such a prominent member and in addition, it was claimed in the Chairman's half-year report that two more regional branches had been formed and the Club was receiving more media attention.[181]

In 1987, the Club was embroiled in a row over a 'vote of no confidence motion' against K.Harvey Proctor, at the Billericay Conservative constituency association. The motion was brought due to Proctor facing criminal charges of indecency. The Club was accused of 'drumming up' support for Proctor, by recruiting right wing support into the Billericay branch. Many recruits were from outside the constituency, which was allowed under a 'vague' party rule that allowed a member to join any branch. Those opposed to Proctor declared that the Club had become involved to save Proctor's political career: "Harvey is a Monday Club man and they desperately want to keep him as an MP. The Monday Club is exerting phenomenal pressure in the constituency." This so called "energetic" campaign by the local Monday Club resulted in Proctor receiving a vote of confidence from his constituency association.[182]

---

181. DPW/40/24, Chairman's half year report, November 1985.

182. Searchlight, May 1987, p.10.

On the approach to the 1987 General Election, the Club pioneered a "Keep the Socialists Out Campaign". The idea was formulated at an Executive Council meeting, when it was decided that the Club would produce a series of pamphlets regarding: the opposition parties; Labour's proposed policies; and the experience of Labour in local Government.[183] In the Club's AGM Chairman's report the following year, it was stated that the Club's "Keep the Socialists out campaign" resulted in four pamphlets but there were plans to produce more. However, it was unable to produce more as the General Election was called earlier than expected.[184]

In January 1988, the Club's Chairman, David Storey, sent a letter to all members regarding media coverage of the Conservative Party Conference in the October and the re-launch of the Club's capital punishment campaign. The NCRCP was re-launched by Teddy Taylor at a mass rally. MP patrons of the campaign included George Gardiner, Bill Walker and James Molyneaux. In the letter to all members Storey had quoted Taylor who declared on the issue, "It is time to strike fear in to the heart of the potential criminals, the robbers, the muggers, the killers."[185]

A policy paper followed titled, Why should the death penalty be reinstated: An appraisal.

---

183. DPW/40/29, April 1987.

184. DPW/40/30, 23rd May 1988.

185. DPW/40/30, letter from Club Chairman David Storey, January 1988.

In the foreword by Teddy Taylor, it was declared that capital punishment was a "sociological necessity."[186] A definition of crimes carrying the death penalty was listed, along with the pros and cons for the death penalty. It was declared that the reinstatement of the death penalty would restore the balance of appropriate punishment. In June of that year, the Commons held a free vote on the restoration of capital punishment. The abolitionists won. Despite this, the Club's capital punishment campaign was again at the fore of Club policy in the late 1980s. All Club members were asked in a letter from Storey, the Club's chairman, to contact the Chairman of their Conservative association to support the campaign.[187]

The Club's anti-immigration stance was once again brought to the forefront of the Club's operations when the Yorkshire Monday Club held a meeting in April 1989, which was addressed by Enoch Powell. At the meeting "Stop Immigration" leaflets were distributed, which later on that year were circulated at the Conservative Party Conference.[188] With regard to the 1989 Party Conference, the anti-racist publication, Searchlight, alleged that Monday Club member Gregory Lauder Frost attempted to invite representatives from the French Front National and the German far right Republican Party to Club fringe meetings

---

186. DPW/40/30, Why should the death penalty be reinstated: An appraisal, London: Monday Club, 1988, p.1.

187. DPW/40/31, letter from Club Chairman David Storey.

188. DPW/40/31, halt immigration leaflets.

at the 1989 Party Conference.[189] However, the Club was left out of the fringe meetings programme that year.[190] This heralded the tone of the Club's activism going into the 1990s as the Club continued to attract controversy, with further allegations of infiltration and extremism.[191]

As we have seen, the Club has been associated with controversial views, in particular by taking up opposition to decolonisation and immigration. It has received considerable attention in the media and was important enough for a substantial number of MPs to have become members, including members of the Cabinet and Shadow Cabinet. However, more than that, as we have seen, the Club developed a comprehensive policy framework. A range of key policy areas will now be explored, beginning with the issue on which the Club was founded, Africa and the loss of Empire.

---

189. Searchlight, January 1990, p.10.

190. Amy Elizabeth Ansell, New Right, New Racism: Race and Reaction in the US and Britain, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1997, p.147.

191. See: Evening Standard, 1st, 5th March, 1991; Searchlight, January 1990, p.10, March 1991, p.11; Guardian, 29th, 31st January 1991, 2nd July 1992, 8th October 2001.

Appendix 1

Monday Club Chairmen 1961-1990

1961	Paul Bristol
1965	Paul Williams
1970	George Pole
1972	Jonathan Guinness
1974	John Biggs-Davison
1976	Victor Raikes
1979	Patrick Wall
1980	Sam Swerling
1982 – 1990	David Storey

Chapter Three: Africa – Loss of Empire

"The raison d'être of the Monday Club was the failure of successive British governments to grapple with the so-called Wind of change in Africa."[1]

As the above quote suggests, the move towards African independence was the catalyst that spurred some Conservatives into establishing the Monday Club. To be more specific, the impetus for the Club's development was the approach adopted by the Macmillan Government on Africa, and in particular, the 'winds of change' speech that was made by Macmillan in January 1960.

The wave of independence that 'blew' throughout Africa was intensified by Macmillan's speech. In Britain, however, as the Club's own historian was later to note, "Rebelling against Macmillan's 'winds of change' speech a tiny group of young Conservatives dissentients (sic) formed the Monday Club."[2] Not surprisingly, in the formative years of the Club's existence the central issues were Africa and the renunciation of British interests in that continent.

Although it is not the intention of this chapter to discuss in detail the historical development of colonial Africa, it is essential to outline the events that culminated in the 'winds of change'. The origins of the wave of independence that swept through Africa in the 1960s can be found in the Second World War. It was during this period that the African continent

---

1. Monday World, Spring 1970, p.2.

2. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.5.

experienced an awakening of nationalist consciousness which resulted in the proliferation of groups such as the African National Congress (ANC) in Nyasaland in 1943 and later in Northern Rhodesia in 1948.

It was during this period that the Labour Party promised the colonies that should Labour take Office after the war, they would experience "a period of unprecedented development and progress under the guidance of the mother country...if money is needed for these purposes it should be laid out prudently, but in no niggling spirit."[3] However, the main reason for this, John Callaghan argues, was that Africa was of "economic value to Britain" and as Britain needed cheap imports and markets to receive its exports "The captive colonial economies could be useful on both counts, but only if they were developed".[4]

However, when Labour took office in 1945 it was realised that developing the colonies was going to be hindered by the terrible economic conditions that prevailed in post war Britain. Despite the fiscal constraints faced by the Labour Government, the Colonial Development Act was passed in 1945 providing £125mn to be spent over a 10 year period. Other colonial development acts were passed in 1949 and 1950, and in addition, the Colonial Development Corporation and the Overseas Food Corporation were established, which had borrowing powers of £100mn and £50mn, respectively. All of these were designed to bring about the development of the colonies.[5]

---

3. Partha Sarathi Gupta, Imperialism and the British Labour Movement 1914 – 1964, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1975, p.282.

4. Callaghan, op. cit., p.99.

5. Childs, op. cit., p.54.

British attempts to enhance the prospects of the colonies proved to be less than successful. Callaghan declared that "Relatively modest amounts of capital were found to fund specific projects".[6] For example, the Tanganyika groundnuts project, which was an attempt to eradicate the problem of food shortages, failed, wasting millions of pounds. On the whole Labour's policy towards the colonies could be regarded as centring on economic development, rather than attempting to foster political advancement which could have prepared them for self-government. It was this particular aspect of the Labour Government's foreign policy that proved most damaging to the African continent, as it was becoming increasingly obvious that the growth of African political consciousness would result in the colonies clamouring for independence. As a consequence of this short-sightedness, the period of the 1950s witnessed a large amount of political activity and civil disruption in many African states led by the nationalist movements such as the ANC. The white leaders in territories such as Northern and Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland saw the nationalist movements as a threat to white supremacy, thus in order to retain their power they formed the Central African Federation (CAF). The Federation was established on August 1st 1953, its prime objective being to form a block against black majority rule. The Federation met opposition from the nationalists. Hostility towards the Federation was also apparent outside Africa, for example, in the UK where the Labour and Liberal Parties were both opposed to its formation. The Federation lasted 10 years.

The opposition to the Federation by the indigenous populations of these three countries eventually exploded in 1959. The first to experience this was Nyasaland, where a state of

---

6. Callaghan, op. cit., p.100.

emergency was declared. Attempts to suppress the protesters were made by the police, which involved a large number of arrests, including that of the territory's African leader, Dr Hastings Banda. He was later released by Macmillan who believed there would be no progress in the country until Banda was free. Banda was then to enter into negotiations with the British Government in order to secure independence for Nyasaland. This territory was granted independence in 1964.

Rapid decolonisation proceeded throughout the late 1950s and early 1960s, for example in Ghana, Nigeria and Kenya. However, decolonialisation proved to be more difficult where there were white settlers, in particular Kenya and Southern Rhodesia. In Kenya in 1952 there was an armed revolt which persisted until 1955. Eventually in October 1959, the newly appointed British Colonial Secretary, Iain Macleod, released the Kenyan detainees as he recognised the inevitability of majority rule. Majority rule was officially acknowledged at a conference in London, January 1960. On 12th December 1963, Kenya became an independent sovereign member of the Commonwealth and Jomo Kenyatta, who had been jailed from 1953 to 1961, became the president.

Despite a hostile reaction from South Africa, Macmillan had remained committed to his 'winds of change' speech by allowing Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland to develop an internal self-government based on African majority rule. The countries became independent in 1964. In general terms however, decolonisation in Africa stopped short of the southernmost territories of the African continent. This was partially due to the entrenched position of Portugal, which was determined to hold onto its colonies of Angola and Mozambique, and partially due to the semi-independent whites in Southern Rhodesia.

In response to Macmillan's decolonialisation policy and in order to formulate a policy on Africa, the Club developed an African study group that was chaired by Harold Soref. The initial focus of the Club's attention was Kenya. Its antagonism towards the Government's policy on Kenya was partially due to the considerable amount of economic interests in the country (Kenya had received 8,000 white British immigrants in the mid 1940s and there was "white monopoly of the best land"), as well as the belief that the black Africans did not have the capacity to act politically.[7] On September 1st 1961, the Club held its first meeting at the Onslow Hotel, London, the subject of which was Kenya. Its hostility on the issue of Kenyan self-rule was demonstrated later that year in the Club's first pamphlet, Winds of Change or Whirlwind? published in November. The Club was critical of the Conservative Government's hasty abandonment of the Empire, arguing from an Imperialist diehard stance that it pursued a policy of decolonisation without waiting for "the educational and social advance of the African population". In failing to secure the interests of the white settler population, it claimed, the Government had failed to keep its commitment to "the establishment of multi-racial communities in which the rights of all races would be respected".[8] The Club's then Chairman proclaimed its support for the Central African Federation. The Club's annoyance at the Conservative Party's apparent abandonment of responsibility in the former colony was also expressed in Bury the Hatchet, a pamphlet published in March 1962. It held that Britain had "a duty to the African, which has to a certain extent been neglected", the "duties" which

---

7. Ibid., pp.101-102.

8. Winds of Change or Whirlwind?, London: Monday Club, 1961, p.1.

should be provided prior to independence, it argued, was "to provide money and teachers".[9] The Club was, it claimed, committed "to multi-racial communities" and rejected apartheid on the grounds that it resulted in "injustices which are quite unacceptable."[10]

Although the Club was vocal on the issue of Kenyan independence, its main interest was Southern Rhodesia. Southern Rhodesia had become a self governing colony in 1923 (at this time it had the opportunity to become part of South Africa, but voted against it), whereby the British Government had transferred control of the colony's internal affairs to the white community.

In 1961 attempts had been made to bestow a new constitution on Southern Rhodesia, which involved a larger African representation in the country's Parliament. This was accepted by the Southern Rhodesia (hereafter termed Rhodesia) nationalist Joshua Nkomo, but he later turned it down in the fear that it would result in the handing over of independence by Britain to the white supremacists. When the issue of Rhodesia's independence arose in 1963, Winston Field, the then Prime Minister (and leader of the Dominion Party, which had campaigned for Rhodesian independence) was faced with five conditions laid down by Alec Douglas Home's Government. These conditions, which had to be met prior to Britain allowing complete independence, were: intended progress towards majority rule must be maintained and guaranteed, as outlined in the 1961 constitution; there would have to be a guarantee against any amendments to the constitution that would be of detriment to the

---

9. Bury the Hatchet, London: Monday Club, 1962, p.5.

10. Seyd, op. cit., p.468-9.

indigenous population; improvements in the political awareness of the African population would have to be addressed immediately; progress would have to be made towards the cessation of racial discrimination; the British Government would have to be certain that all of the people of Rhodesia found the prospect of independence acceptable.[11]

In the 1964 Rhodesian elections, Winston Field's more radical deputy Prime Minister, Ian Smith, leader of the Rhodesian Front Party, replaced Field as Prime Minister. This Party essentially represented white supremacists and received near total support from the white population. In response to the five conditions, Ian Smith attempted to fool the British Government into granting independence by making it believe that the last of the five conditions had been fulfilled. This was done by Smith assembling tribal chiefs, who were basically 'puppets' of the Smith regime, who obliged him by saying whatever they were supposed to say. However, the British Government was not fooled by the stage managed affair and the five principles stood.[12] In June 1964, Douglas Home made an offer of talks with Smith, with the purpose of drawing up proposals for independence, but as the five

---

11. Tim Keigwin, Those Five Foolish Principles, London: Monday Club, 1970 and Peter Calvocoressi, World Politics Since 1945, Harlow: Longman, 1982, p.390.

12. Calvocoressi, op. cit., p.390.

conditions were still in force Smith rejected the offer.[13]

The desire for independence by the white regime remained strong and with the advent of the Wilson Government at the end of 1964, it became more likely that a UDI would occur in Rhodesia. The incoming Government, in an attempt to prevent this, sent Arthur Bottomley and Lord Gardiner to visit Rhodesia to assess the situation there. The conclusion of their visit was that there was no possibility of any settlement. Despite this pessimistic conclusion, the Labour Government tried to maintain talks with the Rhodesian Government. In order to assess where public opinion stood in Rhodesia on the notion of independence, the British Government proposed the establishment of a Royal Commission. This proposal was rejected by Ian Smith.

Prior to the announcement of UDI, the Club had held a meeting at Caxton Hall, which called for friendship and co-operation with Rhodesia and opposition to UN interference.[14]

Wilson's continued attempts at solving the Rhodesia problem were, as Crossman suggested, "a bid to hold off the appalling prospect of UDI". Hence, Wilson convinced himself "that by his personal intervention he could prevent it. Only this can explain his astonishing readiness to go to any lengths in order to delay that final decision."[15] However, diplomacy was to no

---

13. The Times, June 9th 1964, p.9.

14. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.8.

15. Richard Crossman, The Diaries of a Cabinet Minister vol. I, London: Hamilton Cape, 1975, p.378.

avail as on 11th November 1965, UDI was declared. The British Government's immediate response to this was to declare the Rhodesian Government illegal, by having the Governor, Sir Humphrey Gibbs, dismiss the Smith regime.

As noted in the second chapter, the Club responded by holding a public meeting at Caxton Hall on 22nd November 1965. It proposed a resolution that the Club should engage in "...protests to the Prime Minister against the sanctions imposed, or to be imposed, on Rhodesia," and the Club "deplores in particular HMG's endorsement in the UN Secretary Council of oil sanctions; and urges HMG to work for a peaceful solution in Rhodesia."[16] The resolution was passed. From the meeting, a statement was issued on behalf of the Monday Club Executive that "The Monday Club and the platform Party at the meeting, have condemned UDI but are opposed to any action which will further aggravate the situation and make further co-operation more difficult."[17] In Mark Stewart's article, "A Party in Three Pieces: the Conservative Split over Rhodesian Oil Sanctions, 1965", he suggests that the Conservative Party appeared concerned that the Club was making it seem that the Party was supportive of Ian Smith, as meetings were arranged by pro-sanctions Tories to counteract the anti-sanctions meetings held by the Monday Club. He also quotes William Whitelaw who declared "the Monday Club went quite berserk on this issue."[18]

---

16. DPW/40/3, meeting, 22nd November 1965.

17. Ibid.

18. Mark Stuart, "A Party in Three Pieces: The Conservative Split over Rhodesian Oil Sanctions, 1965", Contemporary British History, Volume 16, No. 1, 2002, p.57. Also see: DPW/40/3, press statement 22nd November 1965 and transcript of the meeting.

The Monday Club with its Imperialist diehard response, not surprisingly, was contrary to Government and Commonwealth opinion. The Club held the view that UDI could be directly attributed to the British Government's insistence that the five 'unreasonable' conditions had to be met prior to Rhodesian independence. For example, this argument was later expounded by Club member, Major General H.W. Huston, in both the July and the September 1969 Newsletter, where it was argued that Smith was forced into announcing UDI, because not only the Labour Government but the Conservative Opposition had asserted that the five conditions had to be met. Hence, Huston called for the Conservative Party to change its policy on Rhodesia in order to help come up with a settlement.[19]

The Monday Club agreed with Smith's decision to go ahead with UDI, but many Club members would have preferred it not to have happened.[20] Andrew Hunter, MP (a present Monday Club member) has suggested, when interviewed, that although the Monday Club deeply supported Smith and UDI, this did create a tension, as the Club was essentially rebelling against the Crown.[21] In the wake of UDI, the Monday Club can be seen openly supporting a white supremacist regime. It was the Club's belief that recognition should be given to the Smith regime. Certainly this sentiment was echoed in the Club publication The Story of the Monday Club, where the author, Robert Copping, argued, "where would the

---

19. Monday Club Newsletter, July 1969, p.15 and Monday Club Newsletter, September 1969, p.4.

20. Interview with Graham Webster-Gardiner, 28th April 1998.

21. Interview with Andrew Hunter, 8th June 1998.

Black African population of Rhodesia have been by now without the civilising influence of today's white population?"[22]

It was for this reason that Patrick Seyd, in his study of the Club, felt compelled to write, "No longer was the Monday Club committed to a policy of multi-racial harmony... Instead it rejected universal suffrage in Southern Rhodesia and demanded that power should remain in the hands of the responsible whites since the black African was intellectually inferior and politically incompetent."[23] This change in policy is evident as the Club's first pamphlets, Winds of Change or Whirlwind? and Bury the Hatchet, as discussed above, were sympathetic to the African population. However, from 1965 the Club frequently declared its belief that the black African population was politically incompetent. For example, in the July 1969 Newsletter, an article asserted that the black Africans did not have the capacity to cope with political issues. Thus, it was argued that they were unable to express themselves in a coherent way, which meant that they would not form an effective opposition to Smith's Rhodesian Front Party.[24]

At the Conservative Party Conference in 1965 an emergency resolution was drafted by Patrick Wall and the Marquis of Salisbury which deplored the threat of 'penal sanctions' against Smith".[25] As this was ruled out of order, the motion was amended and then debated.

---

22. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.96.

23. Seyd, op. cit., pp.470-471.

24. Monday Club Newsletter, July 1969, p.15.

25. Stuart, op. cit., p.55.

The motion was defeated, but only after a rousing speech by Sir Alec Douglas Home, which appealed to the delegates not to "prejudice the outcome of the negotiations between the British and Rhodesian governments and appear to condone UDI by ruling out sanctions in advance."[26]

With regard to the British Government's reaction to UDI, not only was the regime was declared illegal but the Government adopted sanctions which included the expulsion of Rhodesia from the sterling area, loss of Commonwealth preferences for Rhodesian exports and a ban on the import of sugar, tobacco and oil. When the Order of sanctions was debated in the House of Commons on the 21st December 1965, the Conservative Opposition was divided, with the 'left' of the Party siding with the Labour Government and the 'right' of the Party opposing the Sanctions Order. When the Order was voted on, the outcome was 50 Conservatives voting against and 31 voting in support of the Government;[27] "the largest single Conservative rebellion."[28] The embarrassment caused by the Party division was to remain over this Order every time it was voted upon. Hence, Philip Norton's comment in Conservative Dissidents: Dissent within the Parliamentary Conservative Party 1970-74; "From this moment on Rhodesia was a bedevilled question. Wherever Heath positioned himself, opposition sprang up somewhere else in the party."[29]

---

26. Ibid., p.55.

27. Philip Norton, Conservative Dissidents: Dissent within the Parliamentary Conservative Party 1970-74, London: Temple Smith, 1978, pp.45-6.

28. Stuart, op. cit., p.52.

29. Ibid., p.46.

A few months later in February 1966 another meeting was held by the Club at Central Hall, Westminster, under the slogan, 'Scrap sanctions- talk now'. It was described by The Times as a boisterous meeting where Mr Julian Amery, MP, was welcomed with an enormous roar. Amery declared that he would not be party to the attempt by the Government to starve the Rhodesians into unconditional surrender or try to beggar then into submission. "Our aim", he announced, "must be reconciliation. In my experience the leaders of Rhodesian opinion are ready to talk. Let us then show our good will by at once relaxing the blockade and getting down to talks."[30]

This argument was reiterated in a Club pamphlet Facing the facts on Rhodesia, produced in March 1966 by John Biggs-Davison. It was argued that "Sanctions must be brought to an end. They serve no British, or true Commonwealth, interest. They will harm most the poorer, and particularly the immigrant, Africans. They will prove either ineffective or destructive."[31] It was claimed that the sanctions could only harm relations between Rhodesia and Britain and that Britain would be harmed further by a drop in its exports. In addition, members were encouraged to write to their MPs or newspapers.

While the Club regarded the sanctions as harsh and unnecessary, there were others that were of the opinion that they were a soft option. This was the belief of figures in the Labour Party

---

30. The Times, February 4th 1966, p.10.

31. CCO20/43/1, Facing the Facts on Rhodesia, London: Monday Club, 1966, p.5.

such as Richard Crossman and James Callaghan, who thought that tougher measures should be adopted. Wilson was said to have conceded that: "A criticism made against me is that had I threatened to use British troops I would have prevented UDI. Perhaps the criticism is justified."[32] The Commonwealth Heads of State regarded Britain's 'lenient' tactics most unfavourably and on September 7th 1966, they expressed their displeasure at the London Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. The consensus on Rhodesia by the African Prime Ministers was that Britain should commit itself to a declaration that had been made by the African Heads of State - no independence before majority rule (NIBMAR). However, Wilson was not prepared to agree to this, favouring the original five conditions. Yet a sixth condition was added at this conference, that there was to be "...no oppression of the majority by the minority, or of the minority by the majority."[33] Wilson was successful in getting the conference to agree to a communiqué containing the six conditions and a request that Rhodesia restore the rule of governor. It was at this conference UN sanctions were demanded by African States (sanctions by the British Government having already been imposed). But once again a compromise was arranged whereby Wilson called for the imposition of mandatory UN sanctions only if negotiations that had been arranged with Smith at the end of 1966 failed.

The meeting between Wilson and Smith took place on HMS *Tiger* between 2nd and 5th of December. The meeting had occurred on the recommendation of the former Rhodesian Governor who believed that there was a possibility of reaching an agreement (Crossman,

---

32. Childs, op. cit., p.169.

33. Keigwin, 1970, op. cit., p.2.

however, held that there was no real prospect of reconciliation, adding "We recognise we are clutching at a straw").[34] Not surprisingly, the talks failed to result in any type of settlement.

Following this meeting, the Monday Club's Rhodesia Emergency Committee put forward a proposal for the Club to send a telegram, "urging Mr Smith to act on the 6 principles... a move of this kind would make it difficult for the British Government to maintain its intransigence."[35] If Smith implemented the 6 principles, the Club suggested, the British Government would have to lift the sanctions. This proposal was supported by Patrick Wall and other leading members of the Club's Executive and the telegram was sent.

Further talks between Wilson and Smith took place in 1968 on HMS *Fearless*, but they too were unsuccessful. Consequently, UN mandatory sanctions were applied against Rhodesia over a wide range of commodities. South Africa, however, still provided support for the Smith regime and not only supplied goods and financial assistance, but also aided the export of Rhodesian products.

The Monday Club remained fully committed to trying to persuade both the Government of the day and the Conservative Party into dropping sanctions and recognising the Smith regime.

---

34. Richard Crossman, The Diaries of a Cabinet Minister vol II 1966 - 68, London: Hamilton Cape, 1976, p.140.

35. DPW/40/5, minutes of Emergency Rhodesia Committee, 12th December 1966.

It was involved with and supported Duncan Sandy's "Peace with Rhodesia" rally in Trafalgar Square in January 1967. There were two Monday Club members who addressed this rally: Patrick Wall and John Biggs-Davison.[36]

As suggested, Ian Smith was well respected by the Monday Club, and he was a visitor to the Club on many occasions. On November 4th 1963, for example, Harold Soref held a reception at the Howard Hotel, London, in Mr Smith's honour.[37] At another meeting with the Club, in early 1969, Ian Smith was asked whether he wanted a settlement with Britain. Smith replied that if the Government's conditions were dropped, that is what he would want. However, he also stated that if that was not possible, he had some sort of contingency plan for the development of a new constitution for Rhodesia.[38]

1970 heralded the demise of the Labour Government and thus renewed hope within the Monday Club of a reversal of policy on the issue of Rhodesia. The Club had anticipated a more lenient approach to Rhodesia once the Conservatives returned to office and in its Newsletter, it was declared that the Monday Club would be able to exert pressure on the new Government.[39]

The Monday Club's interpretation of events in the former African colonies presented a

---

36. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.11.

37. The Times, 5th November 1963, p.12.

38. DPW/40/8.

39. Monday Club Newsletter, April 1970, p.7.

picture of once prosperous well run countries becoming disastrously administered facing civil war and bloodshed. This was blamed on the nationalist parties in these countries, which had, it was claimed, been infiltrated by communists. Hence, in its opinion, many of the former African colonies had succumbed to communism. This was suggested in the Club pamphlet One Man One Vote: Africa A to Z. However, the main purpose of this pamphlet was to assert the Monday Club's view that these countries should not dictate the terms of a constitution to Southern Rhodesia as they were not the ideal models of democracy. It was argued that following the path of majority rule many of these countries had become one party states. Among the examples given were Kenya and Tanzania.[40]

The Conservative Party's General Election manifesto had pledged that a Conservative Government "would make a further effort to find a sensible and just solution in accordance with the five principles which we have consistently maintained."[41] This was repeated in the Queen's speech in July 1970 and was later transposed into action by the Foreign Secretary, Alec Douglas Home, when in November he sent a preliminary communiqué to the Smith regime. Consequently, discussions opened between Douglas Home and Smith, which were particularly pressing as Rhodesia had declared itself a Republic and consequently had developed a new constitution, which permanently denied Africans a majority Parliament. Thus, Home went to Salisbury in an attempt to come to some sort of agreement with Smith and achieved some concessions, for example, the widening of the African franchise and a

---

40. Tim Keigwin, One Man One Vote: Africa A to Z, London: Monday Club, 1969.

41. F.W.S Craig, British General Election Manifestos 1900 - 1974, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1975. Cited by: Norton, op. cit., p.46.

reduction in discrimination. Home was willing to come to a settlement on the provision that Britain was satisfied that the African population accepted the new proposals. In order to test this, Lord Pearce was sent to Rhodesia to assess whether or not the black majority was in favour of the new proposals.

The Monday Club was to pass judgement on each of these conditions, but not until 1970, in a pamphlet by Tim Keigwin, Rhodesia: Those Five Foolish Principles. The pamphlet was published and handed out to Party delegates prior to a debate on Rhodesia at the 1970 Conservative Party Conference. Its emphasis was that the conditions that Wilson had insisted on being met prior to granting Rhodesia independence were impractical and misplaced.[42]

At the Conservative Party Conference, the Club succeeded in getting a debate on Rhodesia on to the agenda. George Pole, the Club's Chairman, speaking on behalf of the South Kensington Constituency Association, put forward a motion for the immediate withdrawal of sanctions. The Club's resolution on Rhodesia was placed on the agenda by delegates voting on the two resolutions which they wished to debate.[43] Pole moved: "That this conference call for the immediate withdrawal of sanctions against Rhodesia and supports the policy of HM government of negotiating with the Rhodesian regime to normalise relations."[44] He attested that the sanctions had cost Britain £500m over the previous five years at a time when the balance of payments was suffering. Consequently, Britain had to pay more for minerals by

---

42. Keigwin, 1970, op. cit., p.2.

43. Seyd, op. cit., p.485.

44. Monday Club Newsletter, October/November 1970, p.2.

going to another supplier. In addition, he argued that sanctions were harming the prospects of African Rhodesians, as they had become unemployed due to the ban on Rhodesian exports. He declared that the basis for the imposition of sanctions, the belief that Rhodesia was a threat to international peace and security, was totally wrong as Rhodesia had proved itself to be a peaceful country. Pole went on to quote Sir Alec Douglas Home in 1968 when he had stated: "I am bound to report to the House that on the evidence I have collected both in Rhodesia and South Africa from those best placed to know there is no chance whatever that the sanctions can bring about a political change in any foreseeable time-scale."[45] In conclusion, Pole suggested that sanctions had actually succeeded in lessening the chance of an agreement, as they had forged together the Rhodesian nation in its resistance to being coerced into an undesirable constitution.

George Pole's argument was supported at Conference by Gordon Middleton (the Monday Club's spokesman on education). He too focused on the detrimental effect of sanctions on Britain's economy and on African economic advancement, while also arguing that applying sanctions in order to produce a constitution based on Whitehall's plans was ineffective. He called for Britain to trust Rhodesia and to assist in the development of a constitution of its own. The main point of his speech was to call for the lifting of sanctions. He argued that the UN mandatory sanctions had been brought about by countries that wished to see the complete surrender of the white community in Rhodesia, and did not necessarily have the best interests of Rhodesia at heart.[46]

---

45. Ibid., p.3.

46. Monday Club Newsletter, January/February 1971, p.9.

The result of this motion presented to Conference was examined on the front page of The Times a few days later. The Conservative Party, it was noted, had rejected the motion, which, it suggested, in turn represented a rejection of the Monday Club. In the same edition, an article focused on the Conservative Party Conference and gave a full report of the Monday Club's motion on Rhodesia. It claimed that Pole was jeered and calls of "rubbish" were hurled his way when he suggested that the sanctions had "never had the support of the British people."[47]

Although communications between Rhodesia and Britain were reopened by Douglas Home in November 1970, the sanctions still remained in force and during the same month, the Sanctions Order was voted upon in the House of Commons; 23 Conservative MPs voted against their continuation.[48]

George Pole, following a visit to Rhodesia in January 1971, claimed in a press statement that the Conservative Party had always adhered to setting up constitutions in the independent states that would encourage racial harmony. However, citing the white population of Kenya, whom, he declared, had become marginalised and had lost their farmland, this had not been successful. Hence, he asserted, the white Rhodesians were not willing to succumb to such a constitution. In his statement, Pole affirmed his support for the Smith regime on the grounds that it had created a healthy economy that had benefited the black African tribespeople. Pole also declared that the new Rhodesia Constitution had met most of the requirements laid down by Britain. However, he called for a more lenient approach by the British Government

---

47. The Times, 9th October 1970.

48. Norton, op. cit., pp.46-47.

towards the first principle involving majority rule. The crux of Pole's statement was the wish for an immediate settlement so that "Britain can regain her former dominant position in Rhodesia."[49]

Crucially, the 1970s also saw guerrilla war in Rhodesia. Guerrilla operations had been on going since the advent of the Smith regime. The two guerrilla factions involved were ZIPRA (led by Nkomo) and ZANLA (the Patriotic Front led by Mugabe). The Club perceived this as communist insurgency as it argued that Communist regimes such as USSR and Cuba had infiltrated Black Nationalist organisations and provided them with weaponry. Hence, the Club feared that there would be attempts by such regimes to carry out terrorist activity and even a full-scale war on Rhodesia.[50]

In 1972, the findings of the Pearce report were made public. Lord Pearce reported that the black majority rejected the new constitution. Therefore, the proposed settlement lapsed and the guerrilla operations increased. The Club's opinion of the Pearce Report was not favourable. This was evident in Monday News, where it was argued that Lord Pearce was not directly to blame for the outcome. Instead, it was argued, he had been an innocent on the issue. But it was suggested that certain members of the Commission were biased against Rhodesia, in particular, David Ormsby Gore, who the Club regarded as a left winger due to his connections with the National Council for Civil Liberties (NCCL). It was further

---

49. Monday Club Newsletter, January/February 1971, pp.15-16.

50. Press release, 15th May 1971, not sent out by the Press Association, Monday Club Newsletter, May/June 1971, p.9.

contended that the Pearce Commission had only seen 6% of the total black population and, therefore, the Club did not believe the report was representative of the black majority view. In the article some of the conclusions made by the Pearce report were highlighted, for example: "Mistrust of the intentions and motives of the Government transcended all other considerations. One witness summed it up in saying 'We do not reject the proposals, we reject that Government.'"[51] Hence, the Pearce report concluded that the black African population did not support the proposals. The Club disputed that such a verdict could be drawn from this type of statement. Instead it agreed with Ian Smith, whose comments on the report, included "I would not have credited that any report could contain so many misinterpretations and misconstructions on the position".[52]

Following the Ugandan Asian Crisis of 1972, the Monday Club issued a press release to justify its stance on Rhodesia: "recent events in Uganda emphasise the need for Government in Rhodesia to remain in responsible hands. We urge the British Government to recognise Rhodesia 'de facto' and to drop sanctions."[53]

Later that year when the Sanctions Order was to be voted on, more opposition than before was expected due to a letter that appeared in The Times on 9th November. The letter opposed the continuation of sanctions and was signed by a number of Conservative back-

---

51. Monday News, July 1972, p.5.

52. Ibid.

53. CCO20/43/6, press release from Tim Keigwin, 6th October 1972.

benchers, including Club members Ronald Bell, Harold Soref and John Biggs-Davison. Home pleaded with the dissenters to vote for the Order, but members still voted against it. Of the signatories of The Times letter, 21 voted against and 19 absented themselves.[54]

Before the annual Sanctions Order in 1973, Sir Alec Douglas Home repeated the Government's view that the sanctions had to continue. 26 MPs voted against the Order. Yet despite the failure of the dissenters to persuade the Government to withdraw sanctions against Rhodesia, the Monday Club persisted with its 'stop sanctions campaign'. It still contended that there were no economic, political or ethical justifications for their continuation. It was also the Club's view that sanctions had actually contributed to what it described as black terrorist activities in Rhodesia.

Thus, the Monday Club's concern on Rhodesia was demonstrated at its policy conference in April 1973. On the subject of Rhodesia, Ronald Bell addressed the conference in support of a motion declaring that "sanctions should never have been imposed on Rhodesia" deploring "their continuance for three years under a Conservative Government" and calling "upon HM Government that seven years after the declaration of Rhodesian independence, constitutional precedent, the intrinsic merits of the case, British interests, fairness and realism all require that the events of 1965 should be regarded as past and over and that normal relations should be quickly restored with the established Government of Rhodesia."[55] Bell also spoke out against the previous Wilson Government's decision to ask the UN to impose international

---

54. The Times, 9th November 1972.

55. Monday News, June 1973, p.2.

sanctions against the Smith regime, claiming it was "the most dastardly disloyalty conceivable to the British race around the world."[56]

The Monday Club's close ties with Rhodesia remained firm and visits by Club members continued. In the House of Commons in November 1973 for instance, Harold Soref gave a speech that reported on his visit to Rhodesia. He declared that it was a free democracy that spent more on the welfare of black Africans per capita than any other country to its north. Hence, he stated that he failed to see why Rhodesia continued to be persecuted. He claimed that Rhodesia was a free country with a free press, compared to other African nations. He also argued that Rhodesia was not in any way a threat to world peace; rather Rhodesia, he said, was our friend. Consequently, he declared, "I believe that these sanctions are vindictive. They achieve absolutely nothing politically and if, as may well be proved, they have an unfortunate economic effect on Rhodesia, surely to create economic suffering is nothing of which one could be proud. It is something of which we should be ashamed on behalf of our own people."[57] Likewise in Monday News, in early 1975, Harold Soref proposed that if Rhodesia abided by the British Government's six conditions it would become "another African slum." He argued that the constitution demanded by Britain via the six conditions were not a model of democracy or freedom.[58]

As well as the Club's focus on sanctions, it also, as suggested, expressed a concern over

---

56. Ibid.

57. Monday News, January/February 1974, p.3.

58. Monday News, January/February 1975, p.2.

communist insurgency in former African colonies. This was the focus of a series of speeches made by prominent Club members at a meeting held jointly by the Monday Club and the Anglo-Rhodesian Society in April 1976. The addresses given by Julian Amery, John Biggs-Davison, Stephen Hastings, Harold Soref and Patrick Wall, were later published as a Monday Club pamphlet; Rhodesia and the Threat to the West. The central theme of the publication was Soviet intervention in southern African states, particular in Angola, which, it was argued, could possibly spread into Rhodesia and South Africa, where the West had vested interests.[59]

Julian Amery discussed the economic interests the West had in Southern Africa, in particular the mineral wealth. He argued that these interests should be defended and protected from communist powers; "the real threat comes not from the racial conflict, but from soviet imperialism."[60] Amery also argued that the British Government had assisted the communists, by insisting on black majority rule in Rhodesia. In conclusion, he put forward proposals for combating communism in southern Africa with aid to be given to the Front Line states such as Zambia, Botswana and Malawi as well as military support if they took a stance against the Soviet Union.[61]

Of the other speeches, that by Stephen Hastings centred on the approach towards Rhodesia by Britain: "the Rhodesian situation...is the direct result of timidity, misjudgement and even

---

59. Rhodesia and the Threat to the West, London: Monday Club, 1976, pp.2-3.

60. Ibid., p.5.

61. Ibid., p.7.

duplicity by a series of British Governments."[62] Once again he asserted that the present British Government was doing very little to ease the situation in Rhodesia and was in fact leading Rhodesia down a road of Soviet intervention. Harold Soref for his part concentrated on the question of Robert Mugabe. He argued that Mugabe had met with the IRA with the intention of acquiring knowledge of its terrorist tactics with the purpose of employing these tactics in Rhodesia. It was Soref's view that events in Rhodesia held the key to Africa's future and the future of the Western World: "If Rhodesia goes under, the free world is on the skids to its own destruction."[63]

The final speech, made by Patrick Wall, expressed the greatest fear of the Club and Anglo-Rhodesian Society members, namely the proliferation of communism in Africa: "Rhodesia is next on the list as an essential preliminary to an attack on South Africa and the eventual neutralisation and defeat or surrender of Western Europe."[64] Consequently, Wall called for the immediate lifting of Rhodesian sanctions and the withdrawal of the arms embargo on South Africa, in order to assist these countries in the fight against communist insurgency.[65]

In the main political arena, there was an attempt at a settlement with Rhodesia at a conference held in September 1975, between Smith and the Rhodesian nationalists, Nkomo and Mozorewa, at the request of the South African Prime Minister, John Vorster. The Conference did not result in any type of resolution, as Smith was not prepared to discuss any

---

62. Ibid., p.8.

63. Ibid., p.14.

64. Ibid., p.15.

65. Ibid.

proposals that constituted black majority rule. As a result Vorster was forced to accept that any attempts as a settlement with Smith were futile. Subsequently, a split arose between Smith and Vorster, which involved the cessation of South Africa's assistance to Rhodesia in circumventing the sanctions, for example, the export of Rhodesian oil and the supply of military aid.

Despite the failure of the Vorster conference, talks continued between Smith and Nkomo. In 1976 Smith tried to come to some agreement with Nkomo; his tactics were to alienate Nkomo from other nationalist factions, thus he worked on the principle of divide and rule. However, the talks were once again thwarted because of Smith's rejection of majority rule. Further attempts at a settlement were made in 1976 when Henry Kissinger (US Secretary of State) visited South Africa for a meeting with Ian Smith. At the meeting Smith was forced to accept the proposals put forward by Kissinger, which involved the acceptance of majority rule within two years coupled with a transitional plan of placing a black minority in cabinet plus a black Prime Minister. However, Smith's interpretation of majority rule was responsible majority rule, that is to say, he would not accept one-man-one-vote and although he spoke of ending white rule, he gave the impression that white control would continue. Meanwhile, after one of Kissinger's deputies met the Front Line presidents (presidents from Zambia, Tanzania and Mozambique) it was assumed that the plan had been accepted at this meeting on behalf of the nationalist movements. However, this was not the case; there had been no endorsement of the plan by the Front Line Presidents, which left the Kissinger Plan discredited and Smith consequently rejected it.[66]

---

66. Tory Challenge, January 1978, pp.4-6.

Regardless of the collapse of the Kissinger Plan, the British, the US and South African Governments were determined to come to some agreement that would result in the replacement of the Smith regime. Front Line leaders accompanied them in their wish. (Meanwhile, the guerrilla activity in Rhodesia continued to cause considerable damage to the economy and the country's infrastructure).[67]

As a result, in a White Paper in September 1977 Anglo-American proposals were published, whereby the British would appoint a Commissioner and establish a transitional administration; this interim administration would have the task of overseeing elections, which would involve universal adult suffrage. The plan also advocated the establishment of a UN unit that would take on the role of supervising a cease-fire with the guerrilla forces. On a specified day power would be transferred to the transitional government, sanctions would be lifted and a cease fire would be imposed.[68]

This plan to end UDI by transferring power to the black majority after a brief period of British control resulted in failure. It was unsuccessful because it still involved one-man-one-vote, a notion which Smith would not accept. Smith's attitude towards the Anglo-American plan was highlighted in Tory Challenge, January 1978, where he was quoted as declaring, "The Anglo-American settlement proposals for Rhodesia are crazy, ill-conceived, insane, rushed, vindictive, disastrous, cunning and chaotic."[69]

---

67. Calvocoressi, op. cit., pp.344-5.

68. Tory Challenge, January 1978, pp.4-6.

69. Ibid., p.7.

In the wake of the failure of the Anglo-American plan, Smith turned to Kenneth Kaunda (the President of Zambia) whom he intended to act as a mediator in order to arrange a settlement with Nkomo. Kaunda was not willing to participate in such an arrangement, so the idea was aborted. Consequently, Smith looked to other African nationalist leaders, Bishop Mozorewa, Sithole and Chief Jeremiah Chirau, in order to negotiate a deal. Eventually in 1978 an agreement was proclaimed which involved the sharing of power between whites and blacks. Smith had now accepted one-man-one-vote, although he sought to ensure the whites were safeguarded by having permanent rights in the new constitution.

America and Britain accepted the proposals but recommended that the guerrilla force, the Patriotic Front, led by Robert Mugabe, be brought in on the discussions. The Club believed that Britain and America's insistence that the Patriotic Front be involved in the internal settlement was risking the complete collapse of the agreement and ultimately civil war.[70] One of the main reasons for Ian Smith's previous rejections of black majority rule was the fear that his Government would be replaced by the militant Patriotic Front. This fear was also expressed by the Monday Club, which claimed that the Anglo-American plan could well result in handing over Rhodesia to the Patriotic Front, which would divide the tribes in Rhodesia thus inciting civil war.[71]

A Monday Club policy paper, published in November 1978, titled Red Clouds over Africa, focused on what it saw as the Soviet Union's "bid for world domination."[72] Rhodesia was

---

70. Ibid., p.5.

71. Ibid.

72. Red Clouds Over Africa, London: Monday Club, 1978, p.1.

facing an uncertain future, as guerrilla war raged and successive proposals towards a settlement in Rhodesia failed. Hence the Club proposed a list of recommendations for the Government to adopt in order to prevent the further proliferation of communism in southern African states: a British presence should be re-established in Salisbury; Britain and the EEC should support an internal settlement in Rhodesia; Britain should withdraw sanctions immediately; Britain should assist Rhodesia in holding elections; Economic assistance should be given to Rhodesia from the EEC, Japan and US; Britain should prevent the further spread of Soviet expansion in Africa. In addition, the US ought to be encouraged to a more lenient approach towards South Africa.[73]

With the prospect of elections in Rhodesia, to be held in 1979 following a referendum, came an attack by the Monday Club on the Patriotic Front, which at this stage had not been included in Rhodesia's internal settlement as it was still engaged in guerrilla activity. Although the Club highlighted its concern at the potential influence of the Patriotic Front, it frequently maintained that the Front was not a viable force in Rhodesia. For example, Tory Challenge in 1978 suggested that Nkomo and Mugabe were attempting to wage a violent campaign in the run up to the elections in order to persuade the black population that the other African leaders, Sithole, Mozorewa and Chirau, were unreliable traitors and the only way in which black Africans would secure their independence would be by voting for the Patriotic Front. However, the Club believed that the Patriotic Front would not gain many

---

73. Ibid., p.4.

seats in the elections, but it could serve to damage the election process.[74]

In the early stages of 1979 a referendum was held in Rhodesia in order to decide on the suitability of the new constitution. The results of the vote were in favour of the internal settlement and elections were held a few months later. The result of these free elections was the instatement of Bishop Mozorewa as the new Prime Minister. The incoming Conservative Government in Britain, headed by Mrs Thatcher, reacted favourably to the Mozorewa Government.[75] However, the Commonwealth nations were not so approving of the new constitution. Subsequently, in August 1979, at a Commonwealth Conference in Lusaka, the Smith-Mozorewa settlement was refused recognition until the warring fractions were reconciled. Mrs Thatcher and Lord Carrington (the Foreign Secretary) agreed to draw up proposals for consideration on a take it or leave it basis, whereby the Patriotic Front either recognised the new constitution or Britain would not recognise the Mozorewa Government. Meanwhile the Front Line Presidents were placing pressure on Nkomo and Mugabe to reach a peaceful settlement. The result was an agreement at a conference in London at the end of 1979, an agreement which became known as the Lancaster House Agreement. As well as a new constitution, Rhodesia adopted the new name of Zimbabwe.

During the Lusaka Conference, Monday Club members were highly critical of Mrs Thatcher and Lord Carrington. It was the Club's belief that by not recognising the Mozorewa Government and failing to lift sanctions, the Government was playing into the hands of the Soviets who would have time to mobilise support and overthrow the new regime. In the Daily

---

74. Tory Challenge, March 1978, p.2.

75. Calvocoressi, op. cit., p.396.

Telegraph, a report focused on a Club policy paper produced by Patrick Wall and Clive Buckmaster, which openly criticised Mrs Thatcher. For the Club, the "failure on the part of the new British Government to implement the Conservative election pledge on recognition and sanctions - after the conditions had been met - must have caused jubilation in Moscow because it provided the soviet African satellite countries with a valuable but invisible weapon - time...Nothing is more valuable to their cause than 'initiatives', 'formulas', 'Conferences', 'discussions'."[76]

The Monday Club's disapproval of the British Government and Commonwealth approach to the new Zimbabwe regime was echoed in Tory Challenge. In a 1979 front-page article, it was asserted that Britain's six principles had been more than fulfilled by Mozorewa. It was argued that black majority rule was now part of the Rhodesian constitution and the Smith regime, that international opinion had been so opposed to, had now been replaced by a black Prime Minister. It also questioned why the Conservative Government still refused to lift sanctions, as the purpose of the sanctions was to bring down the white racialist regime, which had now been achieved. For this reason, as well as the favourable effect it would have on the Zimbabwe economy, the Club called for the immediate withdrawal of sanctions. In addition, the Club continued to denounce the Patriotic Front by claiming that it had attempted to prevent the elections from taking place by the use of subversive and terrorist tactics.[77]

---

76. Daily Telegraph, 20th August 1979, p.6.

77. Tory Challenge, September 1970, p.3.

At the 1979 Conservative Party Conference, Monday Club MPs proceeded to condemn the Government for failing to lift sanctions. Julian Amery stated that if sanctions continued one hour beyond November, it would infer Britain's support for Soviet Imperialism. He continued to argue that: "It would be dishonourable to use the sanctions pressure any further...so long as we continue sanctions we are accomplices in the maiming of cattle, the burning of schools, the torture and mutilation of African tribesmen and the widespread murder of the black and white."[78] The Government declared that they would remove sanctions at some stage, but they were not going to be lifted immediately as the Monday Club hoped. It was only a month later when the Lancaster House Agreement had been accepted that the Government withdrew sanctions.

Elections were then held in 1980 under the auspices of a British Minister, Lord Boyd, who deemed the elections to be fair and free. The result of these elections was an overwhelming victory for Mugabe and the independent state of Zimbabwe was thus established.[79]

As has been shown, the Club had consistently opposed the Patriotic Front and its leader Robert Mugabe. Hence, when he became Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, the Monday Club was extremely critical. While the elections were being held in April 1980, it was argued in Tory Challenge that the elections were not fair, as Mugabe's guerrilla forces had carried out intimidation in order to secure victory for the Patriotic Front. It was also suggested that both

---

78. Daily Telegraph, 11th October 1979, p.13.

79. Calvocoressi, op. cit., p.396.

Mugabe and Nkomo had been assisted by Soviet arms, thus enabling them to employ terrorist activities that would weaken the position of the whites in Rhodesia.[80]

In a Club policy Paper, July 1982, Rhodesia to Zimbabwe – An Assessment, it was claimed that: "While the Monday Club would accept that some modest achievements have been registered by the new administration in coming to grips with a country torn apart by prolonged terrorist war there are, nevertheless, several areas of concern which need to be examined." For the Club, the areas of concern included: Robert Mugabe not acting in the interests of the West by inviting "a number of Communist delegations" to Zimbabwe; the continuation of fighting between the tribal factions, which, according to the Club, had led Mugabe to make "noises about the setting up of a 'one party state'"; similarly, the Club also expressed its concern that general elections, which under the Lancaster House Agreement, should be held every five years, might not go ahead; and there was a worrying increase in the number of white emigrants leaving Zimbabwe which, the Club argued, could have "considerable implications for the future prospects of the country."[81]

Following Zimbabwe's independence, however, the Club's literature showed a decline in interest to the territory, as after this time it was of no real political significance to Britain.

---

80. Tory Challenge, April 1980, p.2.

81. DPW/40/25, Rhodesia to Zimbabwe – An Assessment, London: Monday Club, 1982, pp.1-2.

However, it did to some extent maintain an interest and thus it still maintained an Imperialist diehard stance. For example, in Right Ahead, in 1986, a former minister in the Smith, Mozorewa and Mugabe Governments, Dennis Walker, declared that Mugabe had dictatorial control over Zimbabwe by the use of the Emergency Powers Act set down in the Lancaster House Agreement. He concluded that Mugabe was violating the constitution that had been established in the Lancaster House Agreement, hence he claimed Zimbabwe was following that same path as the other former African colonies; that of undemocratic one party states.[82]

The Monday Club had focused heavily on the issue of Rhodesia from its inauguration in 1961 to the time of Zimbabwe's independence. Its members did not think it was right to hand over Rhodesia to black African Nationalists; they did not want, they declared, to see this prosperous, well run country led down the road of dictatorships and economic ruin. The Club held that once African countries gained independence and majority rule was in place, corruption was endemic and there was a total mismanagement of plentiful supplies of natural resources.[83] Why it figured so large in its concerns involves a number of possible factors. It has been suggested that the Club's interest was essentially a selfish one, as many Club members had family in the former colony of Rhodesia. Hence, they wished to see the preservation of their family interests.[84] Mark Stuart suggests that some Conservatives had

---

82. Right Ahead, October 1986, p.6.

83. Interview with Gerald Howarth, 29th April 1998.

84. Interview with Patrick Seyd, 17th May 1995.

family links, such as, Monday Club member Stephen Hastings, whose father was a Rhodesian MP and there were those who supported Rhodesia because of their business interests.[85]

Andrew Gamble, meanwhile, has argued that to many Conservatives, Rhodesia represented Victorian middle-class Britain, where values such as "hard work, responsibility, initiative, independence," were apparent.[86] These particular principles were at the heart of the Monday Club's ideology, hence to its members, the white Rhodesian population "...were kith and kin not just by descent, but ideologically as well."[87]

This notion was echoed by Harold Soref in a Newsletter in April 1968, when he asserted that Wilson had used 'bullying' tactics purely because he was jealous of the Rhodesian regime as it represented all that Britain had used to be: strong, free and independent.[88] Soref also focused on the notion that Rhodesia deserved British support because of Rhodesia supporting Britain in the World Wars. This argument was used repeatedly in Club literature and by Club members. For example, in the same Newsletter, it was reported that a motion was tabled in the House of Commons by four Monday Club MP's (Victor Goodhew, Stephen Hastings, John Biggs-Davidson and Edward Taylor) to thank Rhodesia for its support for Britain in the past.[89]

---

85. Stuart, op. cit., pp.76-77.

86. Gamble, 1974, op. cit., p.178.

87. Ibid.

88. Monday Club Newsletter, April 1968, p.7.

89. Ibid.

In addition, the Club was eager to maintain British interests in Rhodesia. For example, in the Newsletter in January 1968, an article by Patrick Wall MP, "Conservative Policy on Rhodesia", called for the Government to recognise the Rhodesian regime, rather than attempting to push Rhodesia down a road that would ultimately result in a republic, thereby severing all links between Rhodesia and Britain. This was the main reason the Club gave for continually campaigning for the Smith regime to be declared legal, as the alternative involved the prospect of no British involvement. The principal argument that Wall used to oppose the continuation of sanctions was the fact that they were costing £100mn per year in terms of lost revenue from exports and imports to and from Rhodesia.[90]

Likewise, in the same Newsletter there was a transcript of a speech made to a group of Croydon South Conservatives by Harold Soref, Chairman of the Africa Group. In his speech, he suggested that the Smith regime was better than the alternative, namely a Rhodesia ruled by black Nationalists. He justified his argument by suggesting that this would result in the loss of money to the British taxpayer due to the aid that would have to be paid, as had happened in other former colonies. Soref's opinion on the British Government's handling of Rhodesia was scathing; "It has been a sad case of complete political and diplomatic incompetence. After all, the Smith Cabinet has the best war record of any Commonwealth Cabinet today and that in itself should do much to recommend the Rhodesians."[91]

---

90. Monday Club Newsletter, January 1968, p.3, p.11.

91. Ibid., p.11.

These different factors came together around Rhodesia not surprisingly, as the Monday Club was founded to bring together like minded Conservatives on issues such as opposing the British Government's policy of decolonisation, hence it exhibited cohesion on the issue. It maintained its opposition to Rhodesian sanctions and it recurrently expressed its concern over communist insurgency in the African states. The Club, with its strong anti-communist stance, seemed convinced that newly decolonised states would attract the attention of the Communist block, thereby threatening the West's interests in that region and also the sea routes around the Cape.

As we have seen, the Monday Club's initial stance on the decolonisation of Africa was one of opposition, but with the Macmillan Government committed to the relinquishing of the Empire, it turned its attentions to attempting to moderate its unfolding and to safeguard the future of the black African population, However, in the wake of UDI and the Club's subsequent support of Ian Smith's regime, its stance changed, highlighting the racial aspects of its policy on Rhodesia. This shift in policy from tolerance to hostility mirrored, as will be shown in the following chapter, the Club's shift in its race and immigration policy.

Chapter Four: Race and Immigration Policy

Both the media and academics have focused heavily on the Monday Club's race and immigration policy. This attention was partially due to the Club's hard-line on the issue. In addition, with the implementation of both race relations legislation and immigration acts, and with the publicity given to Enoch Powell, the media and the public had become sensitized to race relations. Former members of the Club, when interviewed, supported the notion that race and immigration was an important issue for the Club.[1] As we have argued, it would be a mistake to see the Club as a single-issue organisation. However, while it should not be allowed to obscure other areas of importance, it nevertheless needs to be carefully examined when studying the organisation.

With Britain wanting to develop the Commonwealth in light of the relinquishing of the Empire, it passed the 1948 British Nationality Act, which allowed free access to the United Kingdom for all colonial subjects. Sir David Maxwell Fyfe, the Conservative spokesman on Home Affairs, commented during the debate on the Nationality Act, "We are proud that we impose no colour bar restrictions."[2]

---

1. Interviews with Gerald Howarth, 29th April 1998 and Graham Webster-Gardiner, 28th April 1998.

2. Zig Layton-Henry, The Politics of Immigration, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1992, p.9.

Consequently, in the 1950s Britain experienced predominantly non-white immigration from New Commonwealth countries such as India and Pakistan. Initially this immigration was welcomed due to a period of full employment. This had created problems in certain industries where labour was scarce. Hence, immigrants helped to fill the gaps in the labour market and they also proved to be a source of relatively cheap labour. Although immigration was not a key issue for the Conservative Party at this time, some key figures in the Party did believe that this may be problematic in years to come: In 1954 Churchill warned that "...the rapid improvement of communications was likely to lead to a continuing increase in the number of coloured people coming to this country, and their presence here would sooner or later come to be resented by large sections of the British people."[3]

The tensions surrounding the issue of immigration surfaced in the 1960s. The 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act served to distinguish between the citizens of the UK and the colonies and the citizens of the independent Commonwealth countries. The Act ruled that all Commonwealth passport holders would be subject to immigration controls unless: they had been born in the UK; their Commonwealth passport had been issued by the British Government; or if a person seeking immigration was

---

3. PRO, CAB 128/27 cc (54) 7, Cabinet Conclusions, 3 February 1954, cited by Stephen Brooke "The Conservative Party, Immigration and National Identity, 1948-1968." in Martin Francis and Ina Zweiniger-Bargielowska (eds.) The Conservatives and British Society 1880-1990, Cardiff: University of Press:, 1996, p.153.

included in a passport held by a person excluded from immigration controls. Those Commonwealth citizens who were subject to immigration controls had to apply for labour vouchers, which were granted under three different categories: the person had a specific job to come to in Britain; the person had a skill/qualification that was in short supply in Britain; or the person had served in the British Armed Forces during the War.[4]

Although, traditionally the Monday Club has been seen as centrally concerned with opposing immigration, the Club's early literature did not exhibit any stance on immigration. Instead, the main emphasis of its political thought at this time concentrated on the decolonisation of Africa. Race relations were mentioned by the Club during this period, but with reference to former colonies, as we have seen with its "multi-racial" stance adopted in the pamphlets Winds of Change or Whirl-wind? and Bury the Hatchet.[5]

Following the establishment of the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act, Britain experienced an influx of immigrants from New Commonwealth countries. John Solomos argues in Race Relations in Contemporary Britain that certain events of the

---

4. John Solomos, Race and Racism in Contemporary Britain, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1989, pp.51-3.

5. Winds of Change or Whirl-wind? 1961 and Bury the Hatchet 1962.

1960s and 1970s raised interest by politicians on the subject of immigration and thus helped "fuel the political debate". He cites as an example the 1964 by-election at Smethwick. The candidates involved were Labour's Patrick Gordon Walker and the Conservative candidate, Peter Griffiths. The election was almost entirely fought on the issue of immigration, which resulted in victory for the Conservative candidate.[6]

That same year, the Club responded to the by-election and the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act in a memo on immigration written by Club member, Tim Hardacre. (This was the Club's first memo concerning immigration). He argued, what had occurred in Smethwick highlighted the problems of post war immigration. However, speaking on behalf of the Club, he declared that, "We believe prejudice is dangerous, discrimination intolerable."[7] He continued, "We oppose restriction on the free movement of peoples within the Commonwealth. However economic and social considerations often must force us to take restrictive measures. But, restriction is a last resort, and the application of controls such as contained in the 1962 Act set a corresponding duty before us. Most immigrants did not leave their homelands willingly."[8] Recommendations put forward in the memo included retaining the 1962 Act but at the same time, establishing a Commonwealth development policy; ban any discriminatory advertisements; more social education for immigrants; not 'swamping'

---

6. Solomos, op. cit., p.53

7. DPW/40/2, memo on immigration, p.1.

8. Ibid.

schools with immigrants. In addition, full assimilation of immigrants was called for, but it was argued that there should be limits on the concentration of immigrants so it did not result in over-crowding.[9]

Just as this memo did not take a hard-line restrictionist view of immigration, the following year a Club pamphlet, Immigration into the UK, likewise clearly advocated the establishment of facilities designed to assist the integration of the immigrant population, for instance, recommending an increase in immigrants being recruited to the police force.[10] However, on a more restrictive note, the Club suggested that on entering the UK, the immigrant should receive comprehensive health checks in order to prevent the 'spread' of diseases.[11]

Due to the influx of immigrants from Commonwealth countries, Solomos notes, the British Government felt it necessary to introduce legislation in order to ensure a smooth transition for the integration of the immigrants into British society. Thus, in 1965 the first Race Relations Act was passed. Its purpose was to assist the settlement of immigrants, assist with problems and educate the population on race relations matters. The Act created the Race Relations Board, which was established to carry

---

9. Ibid., p.15

10. Immigration into the UK - Policy Paper (No. IR2), London: Monday Club, 1982.

11. Ibid.

out these objectives.[12]

The Monday Club opposed race relations legislation as it regarded Government intervention in individual relationships as unnecessary and undesirable. Like many Conservatives it regarded prejudice and choice as natural, hence to establish a board with the specific purpose of regulating race relations was a complete anathema to Club members.

Graham Webster-Gardiner, when interviewed, confirmed the Monday Club's opposition to race relations legislation. Its main objection, he stated, was that it did not believe that the Government should introduce legislation on human relations. Webster-Gardiner argued that the Club regarded such legislation as an attack on freedom of choice. He argued that this Act worsened race relations because it would give special protection to one group. He claimed that after the first race relations act was passed there was fear amongst Club members that this was the first of many other acts.[13]

With the continuation of the entry of non-white immigrants, specifically East African Asians from Kenya and Uganda, came increased pressure to place further restrictions

---

12. Solomos, op. cit., pp.53-54.

13. Interview with Graham Webster-Gardiner, 28th April 1998.

on immigrants. In February 1968, Club members Paul Williams, John Biggs-Davison and Ronald Bell, speaking on behalf of the Club, stated that "Drastic and immediate action must be taken to stop the flood of immigration before it overwhelms the whole social fabric of these overcrowded islands, already grappling with the mammoth task of absorbing a multitude of newcomers of different colour and culture... The Monday Club advocates the immediate cessation of all immigration... In this matter there is no room for compromise. The situation is desperate and immediate."[14] With the rising concern over immigration levels came a shift in the Club's approach to the issue. By the late 1960s there was a definite anti-immigration policy within the Club. A central reason for this is likely to be the increased membership of the Club, which included more radical members on the issue of race.

The pressure brought by politicians and the media made the Wilson Government address the issue and introduce a second Commonwealth Immigrants Act, despite opposing the original legislation in 1962. The second Commonwealth Immigrants Act (passed on March 1st 1968) was designed to control the influx of Asians from East African countries.[15] The law stated that all the citizens of the UK and the colonies would be subject to immigration controls unless they had a parent or grandparent born, registered or naturalised as a citizen of the UK.[16] Solomos attests that this could

---

14. DPW/40/7, press release, 22nd February 1968.

15. Layton-Henry, 1992, op. cit., pp.78-79.

16. Solomos, op. cit., p.54.

be viewed as a racialist piece of legislation and during the period between the two commonwealth immigrants acts, "...immigration and race relations became issues of partisan political debate on a larger scale than before."[17]

Events in the Spring of 1968 meant that the issue of race and immigration really came to the fore in British politics. Powell's speech in April contained mention of a poor old lady who was left frightened in her own home because the streets were full of terrorising immigrants. Powell thus demanded the immediate cessation of immigration and the formation of a programme of large-scale voluntary repatriation. The Conservative response to Powell's speech was one of shock, Heath sacking him immediately from the Shadow Cabinet. Nevertheless, Powell had firmly placed the issue of immigration on the political agenda and in the minds of the public. Labour MP David Ennals, who was a campaigner against apartheid, described Powell's speech as "reminiscent of the early growth of anti-Semitism in Germany".[18] However, in a Gallup Poll from 1969, quoted by Stephen Brooke, 74% of people polled agreed with Powell; he "...was the most admired public figure in Britain."[19]

The Club's response to the speech was minuted at an Executive Council meeting on

---

17. Ibid., p.55.

18. Powell and His Allies, London: Labour Research Department, 1969, p.5. Quote by David Ennals.

19. G.H.Gallup, Gallup International Opinion Polls, II: Great Britain 1965-75, New York, 1976, 984,1037, cited by Brooke, op. cit., p.147.

22nd April 1968, which resulted in a telegram to Powell. "The Monday Club recognising that the charge of racialism made against you is unfounded, supports you in calling for the implementation of existing Tory policy on immigration, and in your stand for individual freedom and against further encroachment upon the liberty of the British people threatened by the socialists' race relations Bill... You are not alone the majority of people inside and outside the Tory Party support you on this issue. Your absence from the Conservative front bench can only be a short one."[20]

In response to this telegram, Lord Boyd of Merton felt compelled to resign from his position as joint patron of the Club. "Having read that a letter had been sent to Mr. Powell supporting the general line taken in his speech (at Birmingham), I felt I could no longer remain as joint patron of the Monday Club...I personally deplore the tone and working of the speech."[21]

The Monday Club's race and immigration policy followed Powellite lines. Powell, although never a member of the Club, received much support from the Monday Club and was invited to the Club's functions to give speeches. For example, in 1968 he addressed the Club its annual dinner on 20th November,[22] on 12th January 1973 he gave a speech to the Club on economics and the Wilson Government,[23] in September

---

20. DPW/40/7, minutes of Executive Council meeting, 22nd April 1968.

21. The Times, May 2nd 1968, p.2.

22. DPW/40/7.

23. Heffer, op. cit., p.657.

1976 he gave a speech to the Club in Croydon regarding repatriation[24], he addressed the Club in Wiltshire on 21st July 1978 on immigration.[25] Gerald Howarth, when interviewed, commented at length on the Club's support for Powell following this speech. He also spoke of the Club being 'incensed' when Heath sacked Powell from the Shadow Cabinet. Howarth claimed that by Powell making that speech he helped to defuse a very difficult situation. To highlight his point, Howarth drew comparison with the wets amongst the Party at the time, Ian Gilmour and David Lane, who he described as living in fine houses. The issue of immigration effected ordinary people who, he argued, were unrepresented.[26] Graham Webster-Gardiner was a member of the Federation of Conservative Students (FCS) at the time of Powell's speech, as well as being a member of the Monday Club. He recalled when interviewed later, that the FCS was asked by CCO to denounce the speech, but instead the FCS passed a motion endorsing it.[27]

In the same year as Powell's speech, the second Race Relations Act was passed. It established the Community Relations Commission (CRC) which had a dual role as: an advisory board for the Home Secretary; and to educate the population to prevent racial prejudice. The Race Relations board was expanded under the Act thereby giving it greater powers to investigate claims of discrimination, allowing legal action

---

24. Ibid., pp.778-9.

25. Ibid., p.806.

26. Interview with Gerald Howarth, 29th April 1998.

27. Interview with Graham Webster-Gardiner, 28th April 1998.

if necessary. The Act also made it illegal to discriminate on grounds of race, in employment, housing and the provision of other services.[28]

At the end of 1968, the Conservative Political Centre carried out a survey amongst its 412 constituency groups on the subject of immigration. 327 of the constituency groups wanted the cessation of all immigration, another 55 wanted to limit immigration of dependents plus a 5-year ban on immigration. As well as these results, the survey also showed that there had been suggestions of establishing "special housing areas on an apartheid system... permanent camps in which immigrants could be placed".[29] The results of this survey, alone, would suggest that an anti-immigration sentiment was more widespread within the Conservative Party (certainly at grass roots level) than perhaps the Conservative Parliamentary Party would have liked and in that sense the Monday Club was closer to the grass roots.

The following year, the Monday Club's hard-line approach to immigration was expressed in a key pamphlet - Who Goes Home? -Immigration and Repatriation. It was written by George Kennedy Young following a rally held at Birmingham, which was organised by the Society of Individual Freedom (which exhibited cross membership with the Monday Club). The theme of the rally was the Race Relations Acts of 1965 and 1968 which were regarded by the author as being an "engine of

---

28. Layton-Henry, 1992, op. cit., p.53.

29. Walker, op. cit., p.111.

oppression".[30] The 1968 Act was criticised by Young, as it was seen as promoting positive discrimination. This was abhorred by the author who regarded it not as attaining equal rights, but rather, granting privileges to certain parts of society: "The coloured immigrant communities in this country would be put in a position of special privilege of the most striking kind and the original inhabitants would feel and be, oppressed and harassed."[31]

Young argued that the ethnic minorities were in a sense 'forced' to recognise racism by the race relations organisations, otherwise, he claimed, the immigrants would not be conscious of its existence. He supported this assertion by quoting the Director of Political and Economic Planning; "...discrimination is rarely sufficiently overt for the coloured immigrant to be aware that he is being discriminated against".[32]

It was Young's opinion that the Race Relation Acts had led to prejudice and disillusionment amongst the indigenous population. He declared that this had happened in Germany prior to the Nazi State. The use of dramatic comparisons extended to Young's accolade of Enoch Powell, whom he likened to Churchill.[33]

---

30. George K Young, Who Goes Home? - Immigration and Repatriation, London: Monday Club, 1969, p.3.

31. Ibid., p.4.

32. Ibid., p.5.

33. Ibid., p.13.

An essential theme of the Monday Club's policy on race and immigration was that of repatriation. In Who goes Home? Young recommended the establishment of a viable, voluntary, repatriation scheme (previously called for by Powell), arguing that Britain was one of the only European countries that did not practice a programme of "determining its own population".[34] In the initial draft of this pamphlet, which was originally titled "Is Repatriation Possible?", compulsory repatriation was recommended. However, Sir Patrick Wall, who was given the draft copy, commented that he could not advocate compulsory repatriation which Young suggested in the final chapter, so it was altered to make it less controversial.[35] After seeing the draft, former Club Chairman Paul Bristol resigned stating that it was "even more extreme than the published version."[36]

The Monday Club's concern on race and immigration resulted in it becoming embroiled in the so-called 'Surbiton Affair' in October 1969. As noted in the second chapter, it was alleged that Monday Club members attempted to oust the official Conservative candidate for Surbiton, Nigel Fisher. The Club members in the constituency actively campaigned against Fisher on the basis that his attitude on immigration was too liberal. Members' attempts to oust a prospective Conservative

---

34. DPW/40/56, draft copy of Who Goes Home? (Original title "Is repatriation possible?"), 1969.

35. Ibid.

36. Dorril and Ramsay, op. cit., p.225.

MP failed and expulsions from the Club of the offending members quickly followed. The Club as a whole was highly critical of the behaviour of the local branch, issuing a press statement a few months later, declaring that the Club supported any official Conservative Party candidates, including Nigel Fisher.[37]

Although anti-immigration sentiments were prominent throughout the Conservative Party, by Heath sacking Powell, he demonstrated his intolerance for overtly anti-immigration expression. However, the Party did recognise the popularity of controlling levels of immigration and in its 1970 General Election Manifesto, it pledged that there would "...be no further large scale permanent immigration."[38] In response to this, the March issue of the Club's Newsletter carried a press release (issued by the Club's director), that stated that the Club "welcomes the policies adopted last weekend by the shadow cabinet on... immigration."[39]

In a further press release issued in March, the Club focused on the 'problem' of the increasing immigrant population and Government immigration statistics. It called for the Government to put a stop to Kenyan Asians entering Britain.[40] The Monday Club agreed with Powell's disputation of figures given to the House of Commons on 16th April 1970 on New Commonwealth immigration. The Club and Powell believed that

---

37. CCO3/7/33, press statement, 22nd May 1970.

38. The Times, 23rd April 1968, p.2.

39. Monday Club Newsletter, March 1970, p.5.

40. Monday Club Newsletter, April 1970, p.3.

statistics had been greatly underestimated. Both predicted that the increasing immigrant population would result in social disintegration and would pose a threat to national security. As previously recommended, the Club called on the Government to cease 'coloured' immigration and embark on a massive repatriation programme.[41]

In the latter part of 1970, the British Government announced its proposal for 170,000 East African Asians to be made exempt from immigration laws. Not surprisingly the Monday Club's reaction to this was very hostile. The Daily Telegraph carried a letter from the Club's Chairman, George Pole, in which he argued that the decision of the British Government to allow East African Asians to by-pass immigration laws could harm not only the confidence of the indigenous population, but also that of the settled immigrant population. Pole called for the Government to take responsibility for its own people and place controls on its population.[42]

The 1971 Immigration Act replaced previous legislation, namely the Commonwealth Immigration Act 1962 and 1968, placing greater restrictions on immigrants by ensuring persons wishing to enter the UK permanently had close connections via descent or citizenship. Recently released documents from the Public Records Office indicate that the legislation was designed to stem the flow of Asian immigrants from the New Commonwealth countries; however, it was also designed to ease the rules for

---

41. The Times, 17th February 1971, p.2.

42. Monday Club Newsletter, October/November 1970 and Daily Telegraph, 16th September, 1970.

entry of white immigrants from Old Commonwealth countries, such as Australia and Canada. The measure employed to do this was the condition that, a citizen would be exempt from immigration controls if they had a UK born parent or grandparent. Although Heath's cabinet recognised that they could be accused of discrimination, Home Secretary, Reginald Maulding argued that "more stringent" measures were necessary in order to prevent "a resurgence of new Commonwealth immigration" which would "inflame community relations".[43]

The Monday Club reacted to this legislation with caution. In a press release issued by the Club's Director it was announced that the Club was considering the Government's Immigration Act. However, its general impression, it stated, was that the Act was "...too narrow" and fell short "...of what at the time of the General Election was considered to be Conservative policy".[44] In the statement, the Club also called for: the registering of all foreign students with the police (the Club considered that without such a measure this could be a way in which illegal immigrants could enter the country); the cessation of allowing dependents of immigrants into the UK; repeal of all Race Relations Acts; and the abolition of the Community Relations Commission and the Race Relations Board, as well as the halting of public funds being given to voluntary organisations in the race relations field as they were seen by the Club as being of left wing persuasion.[45]

---

43. Wolverhampton Express and Star, 1st January 2002.

44. Monday Club Newsletter, March/April 1971, p.5.

45. The Times, 7th February 1972, p.2.

Later that year, the Club published a pamphlet, Standing Room Only -The Population Problem in Britain, written by Geoffrey Baber. He essentially focused on the problem of population growth in Britain, which had allegedly been hidden by the Government because the real statistics would have made disastrous reading.[46] The key area of the population that was targeted in the pamphlet was the immigrant population, not necessarily, Baber argued, because of the amount of immigrants coming into the country each year, but rather because of the immigrant birth rate. For example, it was estimated that by 1979, 22% of the children under 15 years of age in Birmingham would be black. It was also claimed that a high proportion of immigrants were to blame for the deprivation that was so apparent in the inner cities, where immigrants were highly concentrated: "Already it can be said that without past immigration, we would have considerably fewer slums today."[47] Baber believed the problem of the growth in population was so great, that even if a population control programme was put into immediate effect, the benefits of it would not be felt until it had been in operation for at least 25 years.[48] John Biggs-Davidson MP provided a 'Foreword of Dissent' for the pamphlet, in which he noted his disapproval of Baber's support for population control, because Biggs-Davison believed that it was not in line with Conservative Party beliefs.

---

46. Geoffrey Baber, Standing Room Only - the Population Problem in Britain, London: Monday Club, 1971, p.7.

47. Ibid., p.11.

48. Ibid., p.2.

By November 1971, the issue of race and immigration had become an important part of the Monday Club's policy framework. As a result, a seven-man committee was established with the purpose of supporting Powellite ideas. The Committee was to be chaired by Geoffrey Baber and also included Ronald Bell, Q.C., MP, John Stokes, MP, George K Young, Richard Ritchie, Harold Soref, MP and Gerald Howarth. Baber was quoted as saying: "We intend to bring as much pressure to bear on Government as possible. We want compulsory repatriation of illegal immigrants and more to be done about assisting those who want to return...This is going to be the biggest issue facing the Monday Club...100% of the members are behind us, if not, they would not belong to the Club."[49]

Due to the Monday Club's outspoken support for Powell it is hardly surprising that extreme right factions, such as the NF, attempted to align themselves to the Club. For example, in 1970, at the Club's Trafalgar Square May Day Rally, there was reported to be a NF contingent at the front of the crowd of Monday Club members and supporters.[50] It was later claimed by the NF that "Half the crowd and 90 per cent of the banners came from the NF."[51]

---

49. The Times, 6th November 1971, p.12.

50. The Times, 4th May 1970, p.2.

51. Walker, op. cit., p.119.

The whole issue of immigration was magnified when on 4th August 1972, Ugandan President Idi Amin announced, as noted in chapter two, that Asians who were not Ugandan citizens had to leave the country. Although the 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act restricted the entry of British passport holders, it was stated at the time that if an Asian was expelled from a Commonwealth country, "we shall have to take him. We cannot do anything else in those circumstances."[52]

The Monday News focused heavily on the pending crisis of the expulsion of Ugandan Asians. The Club's argument was that the British Government was obliged to its indigenous population, particularly when in the 1970 Conservative Party election manifesto, A Better Tomorrow, it had been claimed that there would be no further large scale immigration. The article also exhibited the Club's annoyance with Geoffrey Rippon who had returned from Kampala and had stated that the expelled Asians would be admitted and would be accepted in addition to the normal levels of immigrants received into the UK. The Club was quick to announce its disapproval of Britain's stance in allowing these people to enter Britain. It held that "If no reprisals are taken against Amin's outrageous programme or if the Asians are admitted to Britain without any countervailing measures being taken to reduce the already excessive total of coloured immigrants, our Conservative Government will have reached a depth of humiliating weakness that not even the Wilson regime at its worst ever touched."[53]

---

52. Labour Research, Vol. 61, No. 10, 1972, p.218.

53. Monday News, 11th September 1972.

However, Britain was faced with a moral and legal obligation to accept the expelled Asians. As stated by Sir Alec Douglas Home, they were citizens of the United Kingdom and the colonies and "Thus if an Asian citizen of the United Kingdom and colonies is expelled from Uganda and is not accepted for settlement elsewhere, we can be required to accept him by any state where he then is."[54] Britain, finally, admitted 27,000 of the expelled Ugandan Asians.

Following these announcements, Ronald Bell, QC, MP, Chairman of the Club's Immigration Committee sent letters both to The Times and the Daily Telegraph arguing that Britain had neither legal nor moral obligations towards the Ugandan Asians. Bell's letter to The Times discussed the implications of giving UK passports to residents of the former colony which had resulted in the belief that the Ugandan Asians were Britain's responsibility. The letter to the Daily Telegraph concerned Bell's opposition to the Government allowing Ugandan Asians to enter Britain. Bell argued that the responsibility for these people should lie with their country of origin. He foresaw very little chance of the Ugandan Asians integrating successfully in Britain.[55]

The Monday Club itself responded to the situation by issuing two statements, one by the Club's Immigration Committee which was reported on the 6 o'clock BBC radio news, in which it reminded the PM of his responsibility to the nation and to the

---

54. Ibid.

55. Newspaper articles included in Ibid.

Conservatives' 1970 election manifesto, arguing that the admission of the Ugandan Asians was against the wishes of the British people. In the second press release the Club's Provincial Branches urged the Government to "...call for Uganda's expulsion from the Commonwealth".[56]

Although the Club opposed the Government's move to admit the Ugandan Asians, it was reported in The Times in October that one of the Monday Club members had taken a family of refugees into his home. Peter Rost MP and Club member had provided them with a home "for humanitarian reasons". He claimed that he had not received any criticism from Monday Club members; "None of my friends in the Monday Club have filed a motion calling on me to resign".[57]

As noted on the second chapter, in response to the Ugandan Asians crisis, the Club established the "Halt Immigration Now Campaign" (HINC). The public rally which followed at Central Hall, Westminster, on 16th September 1972 was addressed by four MPs: John Stokes, John Biggs-Davison, Ronald Bell, and Harold Soref. The first speaker was Stokes, who attacked, what he regarded as, attempts being made by people to "brainwash" the population into despising "our history, background and culture". He also criticised the notion of integration as he argued that immigrants would want to maintain their culture and heritage.[58]

---

56. Ibid.

57. The Times, 24th October 1972, p.2 and Monday News, September 11th 1972.

58. Monday News, October 1972, p.2. Also see: DPW/40/12, re: HINC Rally, 16th September 1972.

Stokes declared that the purpose of the Halt Immigration Now Campaign was "to demonstrate our love of our country", a sentiment echoed by Biggs-Davison who stated that the Club held firm to the notion that the Government's duty was to its people not other nations. Ronald Bell called for the Government to listen to its people and safeguard the nation's heritage.[59]

As a result of the Ugandan Asian crisis, at the Conservative Party Conference that year a motion on immigration was voted on to the Conference agenda by Conservative Party delegates. The motion had been moved by Powell who called for the Government to implement its election pledge of 1970 of no further large scale immigration; he claimed "that new Commonwealth immigration should be halted, even reversed by voluntary repatriation", he argued that the Ugandan Asians should come under this policy suggestion.[60] The motion was defeated following an amendment to Powell's resolution, which was moved by the National Chairman of the Young Conservatives, David Hunt. The amendment was successful 1,721 in favour to 736.[61]

---

59. Monday News, October 1972, p.2.

60. Zig Layton-Henry, "Immigration and the Heath Government" in Stuart Ball and Anthony Seldon (eds.), The Heath Government 1970-74, Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman, 1996, p.230.

61. Ibid.

As we have seen in chapter two, any previous links with the Club and the NF were to prove minor in comparison to the events of 1973, with the expulsion of the Club's Essex branch following John Tyndall addressing one of its meetings. Jonathan Guinness requested that the Essex branch cancel Tyndall's visit. They rejected Guinness's request and as a result, not only did Tyndall's speech take place, in addition, demonstrations occurred outside the meeting at Chelmsfordshire Hall.[62]

The 'militant' nature of the Monday Club highlighted by its links with the NF, continued into 1973 with the 'Halt immigration petition'. The petition stated that immigration was an "unarmed invasion that is engulfing our nation". It also expressed concern that this "invasion" would continue if the people living in the "sheltered enclaves of suburbia" failed to act upon immigration. The petition continued by attempting to appeal to traditions and patriotism. Once again, the Monday Club attacked the Conservative Party for its lack of action on immigration, the Club believing that the Party should have led the way in calling a halt to immigration.[63]

It is not surprising that this petition received much criticism. The Bow Group claimed, for instance, that the Club's stance on immigration was "irresponsible" as "...the sole effect of the Club's attempt to whip up a minority of signatures for its petition would be to harm race relations - there are quite enough pressures making immigrants feel unwelcome without adding this as well."[64]

---

62. Walker, op. cit., p.125.

63. The Times, 13th April 1974, p.1.

64. The Times, 2nd April 1973, p.2.

In 1974, with the advent of the new Labour Government, the proposal by the Home Secretary, Roy Jenkins, to offer amnesty to illegal immigrants brought the Monday Club into the media yet again, condemning the actions of the Government. John Biggs-Davison (then Chairman of the Monday Club) and Harold Soref (Deputy Chairman) were quoted by The Times, as suggesting, on behalf of the Club, that this ruling was "...making retrospectively what was a crime, a legal act...many of those who are guilty of illegal acts will now be afforded the vote and will be eligible to benefit from the welfare services to which they have contributed nothing."[65]

By 1976, the third Race Relations Act had been passed. The purpose of the Act was to uphold equal opportunities and to ensure correct implementation of the Act, the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) was created. This organisation proposed to eliminate discrimination, promote equal opportunities and good race relations and to draw up recommendations for amending race relation legislation. The Act distinguished between different types of discrimination: direct discrimination (when a person treats another unfavourably on the basis of race); and indirect discrimination (when a racial group is excluded from a certain activity such as being able to apply for a job due to job description).[66]

Shortly after the Act was passed, the Monday News contained an article by Ronald Bell, Q.C., M.P. on "Immigration and Race Relations". One of the main areas dealt

---

65. The Times, 13th April 1974, p.1.

66. Solomos, op, cit., p.75.

with in the article was the Race Relations Act. Bell claimed that "the underlying characteristic of these views is a belief that it is wrong that there should persist any important differences between individuals or between identifiable groups or persons."[67] According to Bell, to recognise differences between individuals was natural and they could not be eradicated by legislation. He also argued that race relations organisations themselves were prejudiced. Bell laid the allegation of prejudice at their door because he declared they were biased against those who were not members of "coloured population". He held that the race relations legislation was detrimental to the indigenous population.[68]

By the mid to late 1970s the Conservative Party took a tougher line on immigration. This was highlighted in 1978 when Mrs. Thatcher (then leader of the Conservative Party) gave an interview on the TV programme "World in Action". During the

---

67. Monday News, January 1976, pp.1-2. Bell repeated this argument in Tory Challenge, March 1977, p.10. In the article "Discrimination- race sex what next?" he used evolutionary sciences stating that species developed as a result of differences and life is sustained because of prejudices held by all animal life. In Bell's opinion, anti-discrimination legislation was designed to change nature, which by definition was unchangeable; "...the use of the law in discrimination acts is simply coercive mind molding statutory brain washing."

68. Tory Challenge, March 1977, p.10.

interview Mrs. Thatcher said: "People are really rather afraid that this country might be rather swamped by people with a different culture...we do have to hold out the prospect of an end to immigration except, of course, for compassionate cases."[69] At the Conservative Party Conference the following year, the Monday Club held a fringe meeting concerning race and immigration. The meeting was addressed by Sir Ronald Bell, QC, M.P. and John Pinniger. Bell focused on the second generation of immigrants, claiming that it needed to be controlled. Pinniger argued that immigration was dangerous to the fabric of society as different cultures and races could not coexist peacefully in one society.[70]

Although Ronald Bell's speech was seen to be the key speech by the media, it was Pinniger's speech that was reported in Monday World. Pinniger had launched into a vehement attack claiming that immigration was without the consent of the British public. Hence, the stance taken by the Club and Powell on immigration was "sensible realism" and not racialism. This argument was justified further by the use of quotes from Mrs. Thatcher who had said that we were being "swamped by the flood-tide of foreign immigrants" and a quote once again from the 1970 Conservative election manifesto - "...there will be no further large scale permanent immigration"[71] It was suggested the Conservatives had discredited themselves because the immigration

69. Layton-Henry, 1992, op. cit., p.94.

70. The Times, 8th October 1980, p.4.

71. Monday World, April 1981, p.5.

figures from 1970 onwards exhibited a large proportion of New Commonwealth and Pakistani (NCWP) citizens. This alone was regarded as disastrous as different cultures could not exist peacefully in one society. Pinniger asserted the view of the Club that the CRE should be abolished, as it served to exacerbate the problem of integration.[72] The CRE, indeed, was the focus of a pamphlet produced by the Club a few months later. The pamphlet, Immigration, Repatriation and the CRE, was written by K.Harvey Proctor and John Pinniger. It was argued that the attempts by the CRE to improve race relations were "discriminatory and divisive". In particular it was argued that the CRE itself did not practice equal opportunities, Proctor and Pinniger claimed that it recruited employees purely by recommendations.[73]

A report in The Times in April 1981 not only mentioned the above pamphlet, but also the Club's call for the repatriation of 50,000 immigrants per year. The report noted that Sir Ronald Bell had issued a statement claiming that 20 MPs shared the views of Proctor and Pinninger. He was quoted as saying: "our support is growing on the Conservative backbenches...it will not take many riots of the scale and magnitude of Brixton and Bristol to make many Conservative Parliamentarians think again on this issue."[74] The Club's call for an effective repatriation scheme attracted further

---

72. Ibid.

73. K.Harvey Proctor and John Pinniger, Immigration, Repatriation and the CRE, London: Monday Club, 1981, pp.1-3

74. The Times, 28th April 1981, p.3.

attention as it was suggested that voluntary repatriation should involve a financial incentive of perhaps £4,000 to £6,000 or "whatever the market will bear."[75] The 1971 Immigration Act did not offer money for those who wished to return. Bell claimed that immigrants were thus discouraged from returning to their country of origin, and as Proctor had done in the pamphlet, stated "...repatriation should be available for all those born here or not, who want to take advantage of it...that is the only way we shall avert the continuation of racial strife."[76]

In October 1981, an article by K.Harvey Proctor, "Immigration and Repatriation - Who Goes Home?" was published in Monday World. It was reminiscent of Young in its title and of Powell in its content. Proctor presented an alarming case study of an old woman being attacked by black men while simply walking down the road. According to Proctor "her fear is echoed by millions."[77] He continued by alluding to the inner city riots, in places such as Brixton, Liverpool and Birmingham, all of which Proctor blamed on high levels of immigration. Heath and other politicians had blamed high unemployment for the riots, but Proctor dismissed this notion by suggesting that unemployment and poor housing were useful scapegoats for those who were afraid to admit the truth about the effects of immigration.[78]

---

75. Ibid.

76. Ibid.

77. Monday World, October 1981, p.3.

78. Ibid.

Although Proctor's article did not contain any new ideas or policy proposals, he did put the message across with a way that contrasted with many articles written in Monday Club literature. In a similar vein to Powell's speeches of the late 1960s, Proctor attempted to make people aware of what he considered to be the dangers of immigration, and by doing so, he encouraged them to be fearful of immigration due to the threat of riot and violent attacks.

The same month, the Monday Club Immigration Committee, chaired by Proctor, produced a policy paper Immigration – An Untenable Situation. Referring to the 1970 Conservative manifesto call for "no further large-scale immigration" and using statistics on NCWP immigration since that time, it argued that a resettlement programme was needed. The Policy Paper contained a suggested ten point resettlement scheme that included points such as: the British Foreign Office should make agreement with the NCWP countries to establish resettlement quotas; the Home Office to co-ordinate the scheme and advertise it; financial arrangements for those applying for resettlement (for travel costs, resettlement grant); cessation of all NCWP immigration immediately; training programmes and resettlement measures be established by British Government and NCWP Governments; NCWP Governments to provide accommodation; and jobs for those applying for resettlement. The aim of the paper was that 100,000 NCWP immigrants be resettled per year.[79]

---

79. Immigration – An Untenable Situation, London: Monday Club, 1981, pp.1-2.

The following year, Monday World contained an article by David Storey titled "Immigration - the Threat". The article was essentially a poetic piece, which began with romantic description and echoes of sentimentality for the countryside. Storey used statistics from the 1980 Housing Survey to show that there were high concentrations of immigrants in inner cities, which he claimed had resulted in the violence that had recently occurred. Storey suggested that racial tensions could be lessened by: halting immigration; introducing a workable voluntary repatriation scheme; compulsory repatriation of all illegal immigrants; and the repeal of the Race Relations Act and the abolition of the CRE.[80] In conclusion, Storey returned to a quasi-Powellite imagery used to highlight the 'devastating' effect of immigration comparing the beleaguered people of Britain with "...inhabitants of Old Pompeii in the shadow of Versuvius, at the mercy of a mighty volcano, ever hopeful that the great eruption will never take place, but filled with foreboding that it might one day do so."[81]

Later that same year the Monday Club's Immigration and Race Relations Policy Committee published a paper on the Club's immigration policy. The paper concentrated on positive discrimination. It argued that this type of practice was

---

80. Monday World, April 1982, p.11.

81. Ibid., p.3.

severely damaging to social cohesion. It was suggested that all sections of society should treat people equally on their individual merits; employers should be allowed to choose the most suitable applicant in terms of qualifications, not on their race. It was also argued that racism was not the problem that the CRE believed it was and the only reason why immigrants did not get jobs was due to their lack of appropriate qualifications. In order to improve race relations, the same recommendations as had been suggested previously by Monday Club members were once again put forward.[82]

In January 1983, further legislation was passed to define British citizenship. The 1983 British Nationality Act set out three categories of citizenship: British citizenship, citizenship of British dependent territories and British overseas citizenship. A child born without UK citizenship could acquire it after 10 years continual residency in the UK. This proposed to reduce the numbers of Commonwealth citizens gaining automatic UK citizenship.[83]

October 1983 heralded another Conservative Party Conference, at which the Billericay Constituency Association submitted a motion, proposed by Club activist and Conservative MP, K.Harvey Proctor, for a voluntary repatriation and resettlement programme, this being founded on the notion that repatriation was commonsensical "...it's not racism it's realism."[84] The speaker following Proctor, David Waddington,

---

82. DPW/40/25, Policy Paper No. I.R.2, London: Monday Club, 1982, p.4.

83. Layton-Henry, 1992, op. cit., pp.191-194.

84. Ibid., pp.200-1.

the Home Secretary, urged the Conference to reject the motion on the basis that the Conservative Party stood for a fair and just society, which would be a fallacy if the motion was accepted. He also stated that many immigrants had "put their faith in the Conservative Party at the last General Election."[85] The motion was rejected by Conference.

A year later, in October 1984, another policy paper was published by the Immigration and Race Relations Policy Committee; Law, Order and Race Relations (No. I.R.3) written by Derek Laud. The paper served to attack the notion of Lord Scarman and others that different types of policing were appropriate according to the ethnic blend within certain areas. It was suggested in the paper that this would result in the public losing faith and trust in the law. The paper also concentrated on the ethnic minorities' attitude to the police, which was an issue which had not previously been addressed by the Monday Club. The paper claimed that as a result of socialisation, immigrants believed that the police were racialist, which the paper claimed was totally unfounded.[86]

A fourth policy paper by the Club's Immigration and Race Relation Policy Committee, was titled Education and the Multi-Racial Society, written by Simon Pearce. The main emphasis of the paper was to examine different approaches to

---

85. Ibid., p.201.

86. Derek Laud, Law, Order and Race Relations, London: Monday Club, 1984, pp.1-4.

education during the past two decades. It was suggested that a good education should always include the teaching of different cultures, but that the race relations industry was seen to be trying to redress the balance too far by granting ethnic minorities more privileges. Multiculturalists argued that the school curriculum was too biased towards British heritage and tradition and consequently other cultures were ignored. However, anti-racists took the idea further and called for the banning of pieces of literature as well as alterations to language used in schools, such as banning "golliwogs" and the word "blackboard". According to the paper, this would act as a form of censorship. The final aspect of education that was analysed in the policy paper was the continual re-training of teachers in the issues of anti-racism which, it was claimed, could result in poor education, as teachers would be expected to pay more attention to race than to the subject they were employed to teach.[87]

The pamphlet suggested that educational reports, such as the Swann Report (a report which examined educational attainment between different ethnic groups), only served to aggravate racial tensions. Pearce believed that such reports did not intend to promote integration, but rather they intended to promote multiculturalism and make people aware of racial prejudice that did not really exist. Recommendations made in the paper included: stopping any provision of teaching mother tongue languages in school; discouraging of separate schools on the grounds of race; and not allowing special religious privileges.[88]

---

87. Simon Pearce, Education and the Multi-Racial Society, London: Monday Club, 1985, p.1.

88. Ibid.

In October 1986, another paper was produced by the Immigration and Race Relations Policy Committee, Race Relations - 11th Hour. The main function of the paper was to highlight the Club's belief that there was a desperate need for the Government to take action on the issue of immigration. Hence the language was often alarmist, which was particularly noticeable when the future Britain was addressed: "...a multiracial conglomerate racked by feuds and antagonisms of its desperate elements."[89]

The Committee called for immediate action in order to prevent such a society, listing and analysing the key policy changes it wished the Government to adopt. These were said to be humane and practical policies that would produce a stable and cohesive nation. In addition to the Club's usual recommendations, it was suggested that a national identity scheme should be introduced in the UK. This argument was justified by stating that the majority of European countries had such a scheme and it had not been detrimental to their societies. It was argued that restrictions should be placed on human mobility as the paper concluded that non-European population could not continue to grow at the present rate, as British cities were already seen as "alien enclaves".[90]

In November 1988, Jonathan Guinness issued a statement to all Club members regarding a change to the Club's Immigration and Race Relations Committee due to

---

89. Race Relations - 11th Hour, London: Monday Club, 1986, p.1.

90. Ibid., p.2.

Proctor having resigned. It was suggested that the Club's race relations policy be rethought; "growth of an indigenous coloured community have necessitated a certain amount of re-thinking". Guinness, concerned over positive discrimination, argued that "the Race Relations industry" was ensuring "that blacks are favoured over whites.[91]

As noted in the second chapter, the Club was not included in the fringe meeting programme at the 1989 Conservative Party Conference, however the Club still attempted to publicise its views on the 'growing number' of immigrants by distributing an anti-immigration leaflet, Is this the end of the English?[92]. As with the Club's reactions to Powellism over two decades before, it continued with its opposition to non-white immigration.

The Club's policy on immigration, as has been demonstrated, remained constant from 1965 onwards. The Club has used nationalist justifications for halting immigration. For example, in the Club's Spring 1971 edition of Monday World an article, "Strangers in Our Own Land" by R.T. Allen, focused on the "folly" of post war mass immigration. He claimed that the real objection to mass immigration was not the drain on social services or increased unemployment. Instead, his objection was due to the loss of national identity. He argued that men were naturally conservative as they like what is familiar to them and any drastic changes could have a disastrous effect on the nation. Allen quoted Burke's notion of "little platoons" whereby men have an

---

91. DPW/40/30, statement issued by Guinness to members, November 1988.

92. Ansell, op. cit., p.169.

affinity to be a part of groups, with customs that distinguish them from other nations. He held that certain parts of Britain were "...now forever India, Pakistan or the Caribbean to the dismay and bewilderment of native Englishmen."[93] Nor were such concerns unique to Allen. For instance, in 1970, in the Newsletter for the Monday Club and Provinces, Jonathan Guinness had an article "Immigration: The Nation's Anger" in which he deplored the way in which people were not allowed to show affinity to their own race.[94]

The Club denied that it was racist. But if it often emphasised difference rather than inferiority, this does not mean that we should see it as simply nationalist. Martin Barker has held that arguments on race and immigration that are based on differences in culture, not inherent supremacy, should be seen not as non-racist, but as a 'new racism'.[95] Powell pioneered such an approach, he argues[96] and as we have seen, the Monday Club continued it. As interviews make clear, members may see the Club as something other than racist.[94] But while to call it nazi would indeed be a grave

---

93. Monday World, Spring, 1971, p.9.

94. Newsletter for the Monday Club and Provinces, no.1, 1970, pp.4-7.

95. Martin Barker, The New Racism: Conservatives and the ideology of the tribe, Frederick: Aletheia Books, 1981, p.2.

96. Ibid., pp.20-21.

97. Interviews with Graham Webster-Gardiner, 28th April 1998 and Gerald Howarth, 29th April 1998.

misnomer, to call it racist is not to misrepresent the importance it gave to immigration and why it opposed it. Indeed, in its intense nationalism and its welfare chauvinism, it seems to fall into Mudde's category of the extreme right. As we have suggested, however, we need to distinguish it from its National Front rival, and see its support for voluntary repatriation, as against the National Front's compulsory repatriation, as indicative of a different form of politics than the extreme right represents.

Chapter Five: Economic Policy

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s Keynesian economics was the dominant economic doctrine. Between 1962 and 1963, the Conservative Government had established the National Economic Development Council and the National Incomes Commission, thereby emphasising a commitment to economic planning. Importantly, and contrary to what we might expect, the trend within the Conservative Party towards economic planning was also evident within the Monday Club during this period.

When the Club was established in 1961, its economic policy was hospitable to corporatism and was not clearly aligned to the free market economics subsequently associated with the Club and the Conservative Party as a whole. Corporatism is a system whereby trade unions and employers' organisations are involved in helping to shape economic and industrial policy. Hence, the economy becomes more predictable and trade unions prevented from attempting to "...undermine long-term economic objectives."[1] A pamphlet published by the Monday Club in 1963, Strike out or Strike Bound? contained elements of corporatism with it focusing on how state intervention could improve both the incentives of management and the security of workers in industries where high unemployment prevailed. [2]

---

1. John McIlroy, Trade Unions in Britain Today, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988, p.12.

2. Strike Out or Strike Bound?, London: Monday Club, 1963.

After 1963, the Club was more clearly aligned to economic liberalism, advocating free enterprise, reduction in state intervention, de-nationalisation and a reduction in taxes. However, as we have seen, there were individual members of the Club that still favoured corporatism such as those who sympathised with Maurras. The Club's shift to economic liberalism was due to the general movement towards free market economics within the New Right, with the likes of the IEA, according to Gerald Howarth MP, leading the way.[3] Andrew Gamble argues in Britain in Decline: Economic Policy, Political Strategy and the British State, that economic liberalism "acquired much greater significance once it became joined in the late 1960s to forces and spokesmen of the New Right."[4] It has been suggested likewise by Patrick Seyd that the Club's adoption of policies such as lower direct taxation, increase in private health care and private education, was aligned to the shift towards economic liberalism in the Conservative Party.[5] In this, the Club's increasing liberal economic policy was far from innovative, as Powell and others were propounding these views at the same time.

The main economic issue in the 1964 General Election was how to prevent the stop-go cycles that had persistently troubled the British economy. Labour's solution was

---

3. Interview with Gerald Howarth, 29th April 1998.

4. Gamble, 1994, op. cit., p.140.

5. Seyd, op. cit., p.481.

modernisation, which would involve "more efforts to co-operate with labour and capital", which in turn would help in the application of pay constraints, which would lead to increased growth and ultimately higher living standards.[6]

Wilson's administration was pro-state intervention and favoured close corporatist partnership. By 1965 the Department of Economic Affairs (DEA) and the Department of Technology had been established, these being essentially responsible for managing the economy. One of the first decisions made by the DEA was the five-year plan, whereby it aimed to increase the national output by 25% over the period 1965–1970.

By 1965, with the growth in Club membership, came a more comprehensive policy framework and the establishment of more study groups within the Club, including a study group on economics and one on taxation. By October 1966 the Club's study group on economic affairs began producing a series of pamphlets, the first of which was titled Economic Affairs. The pamphlet opened by claiming that Britain could capture its former economic glories if a government learnt to run the economy "like a profitable business."[7] The pamphlet clearly contained a rejection of collectivist principles; it was argued that Britain was facing economic decline in the 1960s as a direct result of Keynesian economics and that the only solution was to return to free market principles. Recommendations put forward by the Club included scrapping the

---

6. Gamble, 1994, op. cit., p.111.

7. Economic Affairs, London: Monday Club, 1966, p.3.

annual budget as it was seen as an "...antiquated relic of a peasant economy."[8] It was the Club's belief that a budget was only required when "...the long term trend of the economy needs adjusting".[9] It attested that any short term adjustments in the economy should focus primarily on the alteration of indirect taxes, rather than direct taxation (the Club believed that increasing direct taxation harmed incentives to work, an opinion often found within economic liberalism). The issue of taxes was expanded upon, with a call for reductions in income tax and changes in capital gains tax.

The pamphlet also addressed the issue of wage levels. It repeated the view held on the right that wages were too high due to union pressure. It argued that both union power and wages should be reduced. The Club also argued the need for the increased mobility of labour as a response to unemployment in declining industries.[10] As well as domestic policy, the pamphlet also addressed international economic policy, by recommending that free trade be increased. This could be achieved, it was suggested by, firstly reducing tariffs and secondly, by adopting a sliding parity for exchange rates (it was argued that any fixed exchange rate mechanism was damaging to the economy).[11]

1966 heralded a further election victory for Wilson, but also a sterling crisis and by 1967, Wilson was finally forced to devalue the pound. A major problem in the

---

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid., p.5.

11. Ibid., pp.6-8.

economy was so called "wage drift", which meant that there were too many jobs available, but not enough workers, therefore employers were willing to pay higher wages due to a greater demand for labour. This contributed to high inflation and consequently, the Labour Government introduced wage freezes, following the devaluation of the pound, in order to curb inflation.

With the Conservative Party's second defeat in a General Election within two years, the Party began to abandon Keynesian policies and, as noted in chapter two, started turning to the right for policy ideas. Many on the right of the Party blamed trade unions directly for the high levels of inflation, arguing that they were demanding unrealistic wage rates. The Monday Club took this stance and became vocal with its rejection of collectivist policies and criticism of Keynesian economic policies.

Following on from the economic study group's pamphlet, the Club's taxation group produced the first in a series of pamphlets, Money - Yours or Theirs? in February 1968, which contained suggestions for the "modernisation of the British tax system."[12] Recommendations were very specific and detailed, focusing on issues such as: separation of married couple's income for tax purposes; separation of social services money from the rest of the Government's revenue; and reduced taxation to cover the needs of public services. It was argued that the Club's aim was to "build up a nation of capitalists."[13] This would involve individual responsibility for welfare

---

12. Money – Yours or Theirs?, London: Monday Club, 1968, p.1.

13. Ibid.

provision and a policy of privatisation. It was also argued that these recommendations would allow greater choice for the individual, a principle the Club saw as being at the heart of the true nature of the Conservative Party.[14]

As previously noted, the mid 1960s saw the reversal of Keynesian policies within the Conservative Party. The Conservative Party was turning to classical economic liberal doctrine for its policy ideas, as the right of the Conservative Party saw Wilson as being responsible for "increasing welfare benefits" and the reduction in the level of industrial profit.[15] Following this trend the Monday Club produced a pamphlet, Self Help Reborn, written by Victor Goodhew, supported by the Club's Executive. The focus of the pamphlet was government expenditure, which Goodhew claimed was responsible for "rapid inflation", a weak balance of payments, and a growth of bureaucracy.[16] Goodhew suggested that the Labour Government of the day had, in a sense, reversed the concept of taxation, by calculating the amount of Government expenditure and then setting taxes at a level to cover the cost. If the Government then went over budget, taxes were raised. This type of economic management was seen as diametrically opposed to the economic principles of the Monday Club. High taxes, Goodhew argued, resulted in lack of incentives for workers, which resulted in a less

---

14. Ibid., pp.4-9.

15. Dorril and Ramsay, op. cit., p.191.

16. Victor Goodhew, Self Help Reborn, London: Monday Club, 1968, p.1.

productive workforce. He argued that the Conservative Party should adopt policies suggested in the nineteenth century by Gladstone, which involved abolishing income tax.[17]

Goodhew examined the effects of high taxes. He claimed that as tax is incorporated into a company's costs, it is passed onto the consumer through increased prices, therefore if taxes increase then so does the cost of living and inflation is the result. Secondly, he believed that high taxes resulted in incidents of tax avoidance, which as well as being illegal, he claimed, it was also unfair on those who were unable to afford accountants to bypass their taxes. Goodhew argued for reduced taxation coupled with cuts in Government expenditure, specifically by withdrawing free welfare services. He advocated reforms in a number of areas: market rents for council houses; phasing out of subsidies for farmers; encouraging the uptake of private pensions schemes, with an increase in state pensions for only those in real need; provision of free school meals only for those who truly could not afford to pay; and provision of tax relief for those who opted for private education. Goodhew claimed that the "National Health Service is on the point of collapse", so he argued that charges should be made for medical services.[18] To assist these aforementioned reforms, he claimed, doctors should have some economic independence from the National Health Service, which would introduce competition and thus force GPs to be more cost effective. In conclusion to Goodhew's welfare changes, he stated that "The

---

17. Ibid., p.3.

18. Ibid., p.12.

most important initial step is to get away from the obsession with an allegedly free health service."[19] This, coupled with a reduction in taxation, claimed Goodhew, would promote economic rejuvenation, thus restoring Britain to its former glory.

Following on from Goodhew's pamphlet, a conference on the economy was held by the Club in October 1968. This resulted in a pamphlet, Economic Policy for the 1970's, which contained speeches from Rt. Hon. J. Enoch Powell MBE, MP, Dr Wyndam Davies and Peter Rost, the latter two both being members of the Monday Club. Powell's speech concentrated primarily on Conservative Party policy since 1951, which he argued had failed to live up to expectations.[20]

Dr Wyndam Davies' article offered a critique of Government expenditure, essentially focussed on the welfare system. He claimed that after the introduction of the social security system the financial burden of the Labour government "rocketed". The purpose of this level of expenditure was, according to Davies: to assist those in dire need and those who become unemployed or sick; to supply houses, pensions, hospitals and medical assistance; and to redistribute income. It was argued that these aims resulted in a series of misconceptions put forward by the left wing elements in society, such as the claim that a state-run welfare organisation was more efficient than a privately controlled system. Davies suggested that the welfare state led to: high inflation, which resulted in the devaluation of pensions and loss of incentives, thus

---

19. Ibid., p.15.

20. Economic Policy for the 1970s, London: Monday Club, 1968, p.7.

individuals became more dependent on the state, believing that "the state will provide."[21] Consequently Davies suggested proposals based upon a study by the IEA, Towards a Welfare Society, (London 1967), that recommended that free welfare services be replaced by "purchasing power, in cash or earmarked by vouchers, varying income and size of family."[22] In addition Davies favoured the introduction of tax relief for those who opted out of state schemes.[23]

Taking a neo-liberal stance, the call for free market economics continued the following year with the Club producing a discussion paper on denationalisation. In the paper it was suggested that some national industries such as BP, Cable and Wireless, British Steel and BA be privatised and other state owned industries such as British Coal be reorganised to make it more efficient.[24]

As the 1970 General Election approached, Wilson's Government had failed to prevent further industrial decline. As industrial relations had not improved, Britain's share of world trade had continued to fall. Hence, the Conservative Party's General Election manifesto, A Better Tomorrow, made promises to attempt to reverse the problems that had continued under the Wilson administration. The manifesto contained policies such as: to cut individual taxation; to reduce Government expenditure; to reduce state

---

21. Ibid., p.15.

22. Ibid., p.16.

23. Ibid., pp.15-16.

24. DPW/40/8, discussion paper on privatisation, 27th January 1969.

benefits; to lessen corporatism; to introduce legislation to curb trade union behaviour and expand the economy.[25]

Yet despite Conservative victory, Britain's economic decline worsened in the early 1970s. Within a few months of Heath being elected, a state of emergency was declared directly as a result of a national Dockers' strike. This was shortly followed by another state of emergency declared in December 1970 as a consequence of the electrical supply workers' strike.

Initially, as previously suggested, the Monday Club was favourable towards the new Government. In a Club Newsletter, following the Club's AGM in April 1971, it was stated that, "The present record of the Government has been most encouraging. Of all post-war Conservative Governments, this one has so far been the most Conservative."[26] (Also mentioned were the policies that the Club hoped the Conservative Government would adopt, which included: "An aggressive policy of denationalisation").[27] However, the Taunton and District branch of the Monday Club produced a pamphlet in the May of that year strongly criticising Heath and his economic policy. It was claimed that the Conservative Party's image had dropped

---

25. Evans and Taylor, op. cit., p.160.

26. Monday Club Newsletter, May/June, 1971, p.4.

27. Ibid., p.5.

both because of Heath's public persona and because of the increase in the cost of living since Heath had come to power.[28]

At this stage, the Club's Executive was calling for denationalisation and Monday Club members exhibited their enthusiasm for free markets and individualism. In Monday World, an article, "Tories and capitalists", called for all Conservatives to declare themselves capitalists: "(the)Tory Party...is the party which believes in capitalism." In contrast with the Monday World articles cited in the second chapter, this article was highly critical of paternalists and European rightists, such as Action Francaise who, it claimed, was fascist and against laissez faire capitalism.[29]

Since 1968 trade unions had become more militant despite the Wilson Government's attempts at bringing them into line through corporatist measures. In 1968, the Report of the Royal Commission on Trade Unions, known as the Donovan Report, had been published. It claimed that trade union reform was required to implement price and incomes policies, but it was suggested in the report that a voluntary system could be used to aid unions reform rather than placing legal restrictions on them. Despite the findings of the report, when Heath came to power in 1970, there was a determination to bring the unions under control and make them less militant. Hence, the first piece of legislation, the Industrial Relations Bill (1971) was intended to establish greater state control over the unions.[30]

---

28. CCO 20/43/6 Taunton and District pamphlet on Heath, 27th May 1971.

29. Monday World, Autumn 1971, p.7.

30. McIlroy, op. cit., pp.76-80.

The Club's response to the Industrial Relations Bill focussed on, what it regarded as, the "promotion of greater union membership", through agency shops (whereby the employer is allowed to dismiss an employee if the employee is not a member of the union). It argued, the agency shop was "an instrument of conscription incompatible with the idea of voluntary association."[31] The Club declared that the Bill went too far in encouraging union membership. It was suggested that "...those sections dealing with the Agency shop should be deleted from the Bill, in order that the voluntary principle alone, with no possibility of coercion, should apply." In addition, the Club suggested that the Bill would work in favour of Marxists and in order to prevent a proletariat revolution envisaged and campaigned for by Marxists the Club called for the maintenance of elitism within politics, education and industry.[32]

The Industrial Relations Bill, which passed into law, included compulsory ballots for proposed industrial action and a register of trade unions, which would allow the state to supervise those unions registered.[33] However, the Act proved ineffective when faced with the world recession and the subsequent Miners' strike.

When the Miners went on strike in early 1972, the Heath Government announced a third State of Emergency; this strike was to prove most damaging for the Government. It appeared that Heath's Government was failing to deliver on the promises it had

---

31. Monday Club Newsletter, May/June 1971, pp.10-11.

32. Ibid., p.11

33. McIlroy, op. cit., p.78.

made in its election manifesto. The promise of a move away from post war consensus politics and a break with corporatism was quickly abandoned. Within a few months of the strike, the Club was launching an attack on the Government's economic policy. The Club argued that the Conservatives had failed to implement the economic strategy that had been outlined in their manifesto. Not only had the Government failed to adopt the policy of denationalisation, the Club argued, inflation had also risen under the Conservative administration, controls on trade unions had not been tightened and state bureaucracy had increased: "the revelation that the number of civil servants has grown at a faster rate in the last two years than under the socialists is a grave disappointment to Conservatives throughout the country who worked for the election of a government on the manifesto programme."[34] The policies the Club believed were necessary for an economic upturn involved "a drastic reduction of the public sector; a fixed timetable for denationalisation of all state-owned enterprises; the scrapping of regional and other investment incentives; and further cuts in direct personal taxation."[35] In a press release in mid 1972, regarding the Monday Club mid-term report on the Tory record, the Club called for a return to the 1970 pledges.[36]

The following month, the issue of inflation, which had proved to be such a difficult area for the Conservative Government's economic policy, was the focus of an article written by Edward Taylor, MP in the Monday News. Inflation, he argued, had been a

---

34. The Times, 19th June 1972, p.4.

35. Ibid.

36. CCO 20/43/6, press release, 18th June 1972.

problem for both the previous Labour Government and the Conservative Government, but the only 'solution' they had used was price and incomes policies. Taylor suggested this was about "as impractical and crazy an answer as could be found."[37] The principal reason for Taylor's condemnation of such policies were the parallel that could be drawn between these policies and a planned economy. He firstly held that a wage freeze would be circumvented, as they had been previously by employers, through "bogus so-called productivity deals."[38] Secondly, he attested that price freezes would be detrimental to the British economy due to the amount of imported goods; if the world price of a good increased, it would be disastrous to impose a static price on it. Thirdly, Taylor argued that these policies had failed to reduce the level of inflation under the previous Labour Government. Hence, Taylor claimed, surprisingly, "that we would be well advised to accept inflation as the least objectionable alternative", as in the short term, inflation accompanied growth and in the long term, there would be increased productivity in the economy.[39] That, he held, would encourage the growth of wealth and thus inflation would be contained.[40]

With the issue of the level of inflation taking such prominence within the Club's economic policy, it is not surprising that it was the focus of a number of articles. Hence, in August 1972, the Monday Club's Economic Policy Group produced a

---

37. Monday News, July 1972, p.1.

38. Ibid.

39. Ibid.

40. Ibid.

pamphlet, State and Economy: Need for a Tory Rethink, which gave considerable attention to the question of 'macro-economics'. Initially, the pamphlet addressed the Heath government's economic policy, which it claimed, was committed to Keynesian demand management, rather than monetary policy. On the issue of inflation the pamphlet referred to the phenomenon of high inflation and high unemployment present at the same time (stagflation). The Economic Policy Group believed that this fact alone should have spurred the Conservative Government to reform its economic policy.[41] The problem of ever-increasing inflation, the Group claimed, had been caused by the financing of the public sector by the Treasury, which had led to deficit financing. In addition, the value of the pound had continually fallen and so inflation had steadily risen. The answers to this problem, claimed the study group, were to reduce public expenditure and control the money supply. In addition, it was suggested that the exchange rate system should be pegged. It also called for the denationalisation of the Bank of England, in order to secure the independence of the Treasury from central banks and commercial credit.[42]

The pamphlet also examined, in depth, the prospect of privatisation. This policy had found favour with the Monday Club because it fulfilled its desire for reduced state intervention, promotion of competition and private enterprise and a free-market economy. Therefore, while the Conservatives had made a pledge in their 1964

---

41. State and the Economy: the Need for a Tory Rethink, London: Monday Club, 1972, p.13.

42. Ibid., pp.25-26.

election manifesto to denationalise the iron and steel industries, in May 1965, the Club called for the introduction of a whole programme of privatisation. The key arguments against nationalisation, it held, centred around the following issues: firstly, the public sector was held to cost the taxpayer £1,000,000,000 a year in order to sustain its level of activities. A second cost to the consumer was the rise in inflation due to the increase in the money supply - "As a result of the gilt-edged issues accompanying each nationalisation measure the money supply has been significantly increased because of official policy of buying in the gilt's market for cash."[43] Thirdly, there was no such thing as a 'natural' monopoly, such as the Post Office and the Utilities. Thus, it was argued, competition was viable in all industries; and finally the principal argument focussed on nationalisation, which it was attested, was "a threat to individual freedom and choice." Privatisation, the Economic Policy Group argued, would bring great advantages. Firstly, shares could be issued to the public; secondly, privatisation would encourage large-scale investment. [44]

The pamphlet also focused on policy towards the location of industry, of which it was highly critical of both Labour and Conservative Governments. The respective Governments' answers to regional industrial and employment problems were to establish development grants. The Group regarded such an approach as being too bureaucratic and aligned to a planned economy.[45]

---

43. Ibid.

44. Ibid., p.14.

45. Ibid., p.16.

In January 1973, Heath introduced a price and incomes policy (a three-month wage freeze) in light of the poor economic climate. This represented a U turn in his policies on which he was elected. In response to this, the Club issued a press statement: "The Monday Club regrets the interventionist measures announced by the Prime Minister today. They are pure, unadulterated, text-book socialism."[46] However, there were tensions within the Club on this issue. Prior to the leadership battle between Guinness and Young, Guinness had declared his support for incomes policies. According to a document "Monday Club – A Survey of Events", issued by the rebel group within the Club following Guinness's election victory, K.Harvey Proctor had been 'sacked' from his position as Chairman of the Club's Economic Policy Group following an article Proctor had written for Monday News. Proctor declared his own personal view, that he was opposed to incomes policies and he was critical of Jonathan Guinness's stance on the issue.[47] Allegedly, Guinness then dismissed Proctor, claiming the Proctor's "political philosophy ruled out any consideration of incomes policy at all."[48] This incident was said to have caused 'ill-feeling' within the Club.[49]

Incomes policy did little to revive the economic fortunes for the Government due to a world recession and the oil crisis, which was then shortly followed by a further Miners' strike.[50] By the end of 1973 Heath's economic policy was on the point of

---

46. DPW/40/13, press statement, 17th January 1973.

47. DPW/40/13, "Monday Club – A Survey of Events", September 1973, p.11.

48. Ibid., p.12.

49. Ibid., p.11.

50. McIlroy, op. cit., p.8.

collapse. High levels of borrowing led to further expansion of the money supply, which resulted in higher inflation. However, rather than tackle borrowing levels, Heath attempted to tackle the trade unions.

1974 was a turbulent year both politically and economically. This was essentially due to the oil crisis which resulted in a 3-day working week and served to strengthen the Miners' case for higher wages and higher priced coal (the miners argued that if the Conservative Government were willing to pay four times the usual price for oil why should the price of coal be so low). Heath took the gamble of going to the country in an effort to establish the right to govern. Heath's campaign slogan was "Who rules Britain?". The General Election was on 28th February and while there was a high poll of 79%, the outcome was inconclusive; Conservatives polled just under 1% more than Labour, yet Labour had 4 seats more than the Conservatives (Conservative 297, Labour 301, and Liberals 14).[51] The next and most obvious step was for Heath to attempt to form a coalition government with the Liberals. Heath approached Jeremy Thorpe, the then leader of the Liberals, but no deals were made and Heath was forced to resign.

With Harold Wilson becoming Labour Prime Minister on 4th March 1974, Julian Amery, a Monday Club member and Conservative MP, led a campaign to oppose all Labour legislation put forward in the Queen's speech, in the belief that by doing so

---

51. Charles Pattie and Ron Johnston, " The Conservative Party and the Electorate" in Steve Ludlam and Martin J Smith (eds.), Contemporary British Conservatism, Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1996, p.39.

the dissolution of the Government could be brought about. However, the Conservative Party was not united on this idea and thus the Queen's speech was passed through the Commons.[52] The main reason for Amery and other Club members opposing Wilson's policies was the belief that the Labour Government would adopt a policy of nationalisation.

This concern was highlighted in an article in Monday News, shortly after, which argued that with Labour returning to Government, more nationalisation would occur. In particular, the article criticised Labour's green paper, published in May 1974, which was aligned to the TUC's proposals for a Companies Act. This Act would have legally compelled companies with 2,000 or more employees to develop a decision-making board that would be comprised of 50% trade unionists.[53] According to the author, workers' committees would be inefficient and incompetent, resulting in the monopoly power of labour and a fully controlled economy. The article thus strongly opposed the proposal, even though the conclusion tried to appear relatively impartial on the subject: "The concept of industrial democracy needs to be considered from the practical, as well as from the theoretical angle. We would tread warily."[54]

The primary concern of Wilson's Government was to alleviate Britain's economic problems; thus a social contract was developed, which established food subsidies,

---

52. Dorril and Ramsay, op. cit., p.237.

53. Monday News, July/August 1974, p.6.

54. Ibid., p.7.

price controls and a freeze on council house rents. However, the policy did not prevent a state of emergency being declared (this resulted from the continued strikes, the ever increasing oil prices, high inflation and wage settlements of 20%). In October 1974, the result of a second general election gave Labour only a 17-seat majority over the Conservatives. The result allowed Wilson to remain in power. However, it proved that the British electorate lacked confidence in either of the two main parties.

By 1975 the Labour Government had put forward suggestions for a tax on wealth. This was commented upon in an article in Monday News, which suggested that a wealth tax was the first step to a fully socialist programme. The effect, it claimed, would be a dictatorship or authoritarian state, whereby the media would be nationalised, there would be no right of appeal through the courts, and religions would be restricted. The picture painted by the article was of a "Soviet Britain". The author of the article also outlined what he believed to be the consequences of the wealth tax, such as: the destruction of incentives for individuals and businesses to accumulate wealth; and the export of capital, which would result in a fall in the value of sterling.[55]

With the ever-increasing economic problems, Wilson turned to "a limited move in the direction of corporatism."[56] In one article in Monday News, the chairman of the Club's Economic Policy group, John Gouriet, focused on Healey's 1975 budget

---

55. Monday News, January/February 1975, p.2.

56. McIlroy, op. cit., p.11.

which, he claimed encouraged inflation. According to Gouriet, reducing inflation could not be achieved by deflating the economy because of the interdependent relationship between the Labour Government and the trade unions. Healey's proposals to increase income tax and VAT would, it argued, result in higher wage demands and depressed home markets, due to higher priced goods. In addition, the continuation of high Government spending was criticised, as Gouriet argued it already "...swallows 60% of our GNP."[57] In Gouriet's view the social contract was a "...truly dead duck."[58]

By 1976, despite Gouriet's assessment, the social contract was well established. It was based on corporatist lines, involving co-operation between Government, management and trade unions. With the continuation of incomes policy (wage freezes), the Monday Club's literature focused its efforts on this policy. Tory Challenge in 1978, for instance, contained an article by Nicholas Ridley, MP, "These Iniquitous Incomes Policies". Ridley outlined the reasons why a government resorted to such policies, such as: to control inflation; to curb unemployment because workers would be deterred from making high wage claims, thus companies would not have to make workers unemployed; to control trade unions, and as a way of distributing income. However, Ridley argued that these were not justifications for an incomes policy, as this type of policy was ineffective on the level of inflation. In addition, the

---

57. Monday News, May/June 1975, p.7.

58. Ibid.

fairness of an incomes policy was not seen as a valid argument since the Conservatives should favour differentiated earnings.[59]

In September 1977 the Club again commented on the social contract and Trade Union legislation in a policy document titled "Industrial Progress or Political Anarchy". Written by Club member Clive Buckmaster, it claimed that "the social contract is already dead" and he called for a change in closed shop law so more consideration would be shown to those who did not want to be union members. Focussing on trade unions and the political left, he declared that "'Industrial Big Brothers'...operate a closed shop."[60]

By the end of 1978, the social contract had collapsed and the trade unions wanted to return to free collective bargaining rather than having to continue with wage freezes. In January 1979 the Transport and General Workers Union began a strike. Other strikes followed, which caused major disruption in certain areas of the country. The media and the Conservative Right capitalised on it, arguing that the depressed living standards and economic turmoil caused by the Labour Government's policies had resulted in this breakdown. (The statistics for that period did not read as pessimistically as we might believe, with unemployment in 1979 at 5.7%, inflation in 1978-9 at 9.3%).[61]

---

59. Tory Challenge, March 1978, p.6.

60. Daily Telegraph, 16th September 1977.

61. Arthur Marwick, British Society Since 1945, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990, p.272.

That year Tory Challenge carried an article, "Incomes policy and Ted Heath", written by Jonathan Guinness. The article took a retrospective look at Heath's administration. However, in general the article formed a discussion of the Monday Club's economic policy. The main focus of the article dealt with monetarism. Guinness suggested that monetarism alone was not effective, as the restriction of the money supply failed to operate in the public sector, due to strong trade unions pushing for high wage demands. Guinness suggested that rather than resort to incomes policies which, as we have seen, he had previously supported, to keep wage demands within a realistic level, trade unions should be brought within the law, a fixed percentage wage increase should be established, and more importantly, a public bargaining committee should be developed, which would be "a forum for negotiation". He suggested that the committee would be called an Industrial Congress, which would have no legislative powers.[62]

The following month, the Monday Club sponsored a meeting "Campaign for Industrial Sanity". It was concerned with what it regarded as the next Conservative Government and industrial relations. The meeting was addressed by Peter Walker, MP. The meeting, as noted in the second chapter, was followed up in March with a letter from Sir Patrick Wall to the industrialists present at the meeting. The letter included a questionnaire, which included questions regarding attitudes to picketing, code of conduct, legal restrictions on strikes, compulsory ballots.[63]

---

62. Tory Challenge, January 1979, p.9.

63. DPW/40/37, letter and questionnaire on industrial relations, 5th March 1979.

After the winter of discontent, Margaret Thatcher was elected Prime Minister on a manifesto that promised a radical alternative to the previous Labour administration, offering a 'rolling back' of areas of state welfare provision. In September 1979, Tory Challenge contained an article by David Price, MP, "The way to economic recovery". The article highlighted the difficulties that the incoming government was facing, due to the economic disaster that the outgoing Labour government had left behind. Price divided the article into sections that dealt with specific economic problems. These were: inflation; government borrowing; monetary policy; reducing government expenditure; and recommended steps to economic recovery. Price stated that from 1974-1979 the level of inflation had doubled and in April 1979, the inflation figure was in double figures.[64] Consequently, high inflation had led to high government expenditure, which had been financed through deficit financing. Price argued that these two factors had resulted in Mrs Thatcher having to: restrict the levels of government borrowing and spending; and increasing interest rates in order to curb borrowing and eventually reduce inflation.[65] He attested that Government borrowing under the Labour administration had risen to higher than expected levels; £8,150 million and therefore it was Price's assessment that it would take time for the Conservatives' economic policies to work their way through the economy. The subject of monetary policy was also analysed. Price suggested that a tight control of the money supply had a vital role in the government's economic strategy as, coupled with high interest rates, inflation could remain stable.

---

64. Tory Challenge, September 1979, p.5.

65. Ibid.

The need to reduce government expenditure had been an essential part of the Club's economic framework for some considerable time. Price argued that this policy was the only way to ensure a balanced budget, which was desperately needed to bring about economic growth, which had fallen to less than 1% per annum. The first step to recovery focussed on the Government's plan to reduce the PSBR from £10 billion to £8.5 billion. The second step was employing the four principles that formed the basis of Geoffrey Howe's budget: the increased incentives for enterprise and hard work, by lowering taxes; a greater level of free choice by reducing government intervention; the reduction of the PSBR; and the commitment to control inflation.[66]

The following month the Club issued a press release concerning economic and industrial decline. The press release used a speech made to the Club by the Editorial Director of the IEA. He declared that Britain was experiencing economic and industrial decline that could only be curbed by reducing Government expenditure by "transferring" public services to the private sector.[67]

The change in Government did not have a favourable effect upon the economy. In the early 1980s the economy was in recession. By 1982 unemployment had risen to 13.4% and inflation levels for 1979-80 hit a high of 18.4%.[68] Thatcher's monetary policy involved the setting of targets on specific aspects of the money supply; the

---

66. Ibid., p.6.

67. DPW/40/35, press release, 17th October 1979.

68. Marwick, op. cit., p.272.

medium term financial strategy (MTFS) targeted M1 and M3, in order to control inflation. MTFS was abandoned the following year and instead the Government chose a tight fiscal policy to control the economy. The effect of this policy was high interest rates and the loss of competitiveness for British industries due to the high level of the pound. Manufacturing output fell by 14.5% and investment in the manufacturing sector fell by 36%, and "The consequence was a major contraction of manufacturing industry."[69]

With reference to manufacturing, the Monday Club expressed its concern in a discussion paper published in October 1980, Why Bankrupt the Efficient and then Have to Pay More to Support the Jobless? The paper contained a rider: "The content of this paper is most important. Please discuss it with your friends and draw it to the attention of Conservative members of Parliament."[70] From a global perspective, the paper suggested the Eastern European countries should be prevented from exporting their artificially low price goods. Hence, it was suggested that a European standard should be established so Europe and the UK's manufacturing industries would not be harmed by cheap imports from other countries. In addition, protectionist policies were recommended, such as giving grants to manufacturing companies to prevent them from using cheap labour abroad. The Club also advocated lower interest rates to encourage industrial investment. The paper argued that the Conservative Government

---

69. Gamble, 1994, op. cit., p.195.

70. Why Bankrupt the Efficient and then Have to Pay More to Support the Jobless?, London: Monday Club, 1980, p.1.

should encourage manufacturing industry and consequently the Government should persuade the EC Commission to adopt the aforementioned policies and if the Government was unable to force the EC into action, then the British Government should adopt the policies anyway. Although the Club stated it was not pro-protectionist, it did suggest that the government introduce protectionist measures in order to safeguard the manufacturing sector. It was argued that the manufacturing sector provided a large amount of employment and could be one of the most productive sectors of the economy and counteractive measures were needed to curb the cheap imports that it declared were being sent by foreigners who have no regard for Britain.[71] These policies are certainly a deviation from the economic liberalism which the Club had embraced by the mid 70s. Furthermore, this pamphlet conflicts with Club literature on the EC, as will be shown in the chapter on Europe, the Club frequently criticised the EC for its protectionist policies.

Despite privatisation's (denationalisation) eventual role as one of the key aspects of Thatcher's economic policy, there was no commitment made to privatisation in the Conservative Party's 1979 General Election Manifesto.[72] However, privatisation began in 1979 with the first sale of BP (British Petroleum) Government shares. Andrew Gamble suggests that with the sale of BT (British Telecom) in 1984 a "rolling

---

71. Ibid., pp.1-7.

72. Gamble, 1994, op. cit., p.27.

programme of privatisation developed."[73] By the mid 1980s companies such as British Aerospace, British Gas, Jaguar, Rolls Royce had been privatised.

Anti-trade union legislation was also implemented. The first piece of legislation was the 1980 Employment Act. The Act was minimal, but did place restrictions on picketing and sympathy strikes, and it made available Government funds for trade unions to hold ballots on strike action.

With regard to this Act, Monday World contained an article by the then Chairman of the Monday Club, Sam Swerling. The article, "The industrial charter: an examination of aspects of the employment act 1980", focused on trade union legislation from 1970 to 1980. Swerling argued that the Club remained committed to trade union reform in the belief that once the Tories were in power, trade unions' behaviour would be curbed. Swerling first addressed the Industrial Relations Act 1971, which he argued had been unsuccessful, as it had not brought the unions within the law. Swerling focussed specifically on two aspects of the 1980 Act: trade union immunities; and closed shops. Regarding *trade union immunities*, Swerling claimed that the government had been coerced into addressing this issue, by action taken by the House of Lords on certain industrial disputes (Express Newspapers v McShane and Duport Steels v Sirs). It was stated that the Unions could still lawfully pursue actions such as "secondary blacking action" against public utilities and secondary picketing, which

---

73. Ibid.

could result in bankruptcy for small businesses. These actions, Swerling argued, should have been ended by the Act.[74]

With reference to closed shops, the Act did include a conscience clause, by which, "in the case of newly established closed shops dismissal for non-union membership will be regarded as unfair if the union membership agreement was not approved in a ballot in which at least 80% of employees concerned voted in favour, the ballot being conducted in secret and giving all those entitled to vote the right to do so." Swerling argued that for the Club this was far too weak, as it believed that closed shops were an infringement on individual rights. Swerling supported his claim for the cessation of closed shops by turning to Europe, by stating that France had made closed shops illegal in 1956, thus presumably suggesting that Britain should follow the example it had set.[75]

Following on from this piece of industrial legislation was the 1982 Employment Act. It was far more restrictive than the 1980 Employment Act as it included measures such as: trade unions could be fined by the courts for unlawful industrial action; the definition of industrial action was narrowed making sympathy strikes unlawful; dismissal of employees not joining closed shops was deemed unfair; it was made unlawful for non-unionised companies to be excluded from tender and employers were allowed to choose who to re-employ after strike action.

---

74. Monday World, October 1980, p.11.

75. Ibid.

Despite the introduction of these two acts, a number of key strikes took place in the mid 1980s, such as the National Graphical Association (NGA) strike of 1984 at Eddie Shah's Messenger Group Newspapers. This resulted from Shah trying to set up an open shop at the Warrington plant. The NGA picketed the plant, but it lost because it breached the 1980 and 1982 acts. The Miners' strike in 1984-5 occurred due to a reduction in Government subsidies to the mining industry in an attempt at making it self-sufficient. The National Union of Mineworkers (NUM) lost and the pits were later privatised.[76]

In 1984, the Trade Union Act (1984) focussed on secret ballots. It was ruled that secret ballots on industrial action were needed in order for unions to keep immunities, ballots were to be used to elect trade union executives every 5 years, and every 10 years members had to be balloted on the retention of political funds.

Despite the introduction of further industrial relations legislation, that year the Monday Club focussed on privatisation. In a policy paper, Killing the Dinosaur of State Ownership: Programme for Privatisation, the Club called for the Government to implement a full programme of privatisation, which would include the NHS, British Rail, the Coal industry and local government services.[77] Even though the Government had carried out some privatisation, the Club felt that it had not gone far enough. The

---

76. McIlroy, op. cit., pp.88-89.

77. DPW/40/27, Killing the Dinosaur of State Ownership: Programme for Privatisation, London: Monday Club, September 1984.

following year the Club held a conference on economics, titled "The Government's Economic Policy – Why there is no alternative." Once again the focus was on privatisation, as well as an assessment of the Government's economic policy. Speakers at the conference were Club member Peter Rost and Patrick Minford (economic adviser to Mrs Thatcher).[78]

The Club's connection with Patrick Minford continued when in 1986 the Club produced a policy paper written by Minford. The paper, Economic Strategy, initially assessed the Thatcher Government's economic programme. The Conservative administration had reduced inflation by establishing a balanced budget, which involved the control of the money supply, in spite of the short-term hardships it may have caused. He called for the Government to continue with this tight fiscal policy, as "British people hate inflation...but the price of keeping inflation down is stern financial discipline on government."[79] As for the aspect of efficiency, Minford claimed that due to the Government's free-market policies, efficiency had increased throughout the whole of the economy. The policies that had had this 'desirable' effect were: the reduction of the top tax rates; less government intervention; more stringent laws on trade unions; and the privatisation of industries.[80]

Although Minford found these policies highly favourable, he suggested some areas where more was needed. Firstly, he criticised the level of unemployment. Minford

---

78. DPW/40/28, Conference on Economics, 29th June 1985.

79. Patrick Minford, Economic Strategy, London: Monday Club, 1986, pp.1-4.

80. Ibid.

recommended the implementation of restart interviews, whereby if the claimant refused to take a job or retrain, benefits would be stopped. Secondly, the health and education systems were seen as inefficient. Minford claimed that the reason for the lack of efficiency was the absence of competitive forces, which could be overcome by the introduction of health and education vouchers. This would enable the consumer to choose the best school or hospital, thus encouraging these to be more efficient and more cost productive. Thirdly, the taxation system was set at too high a rate, therefore Minford advocated the abolition of the top rate tax, as well as the reduction of standard income tax, and in addition, a decrease in the level of VAT.[81]

In a 1986 issue of a Club publication, Capitalist Worker, which was produced by the younger members of the Monday Club, there was a renewed call for the abolition of corporatism and the restoration of free market capitalism. It opposed a mixed economy and hence called for the privatisation of post offices, the BBC, the mines and the railways. It also called for the abandonment of rent controls, equal opportunity legislation, and for an ending of state welfare, and for free markets to be introduced in education, and medicine. This, it argued, would allow for reduced taxes and VAT, as government spending would be reduced.[82]

The 1987 General Election returned Thatcher to power. At this stage the economy was healthy, with the economic growth rate reaching 4%. The rate of individual

---

81. Ibid.

82. Capitalist Worker, October/November 1986, p.1.

taxation had been reduced dramatically. However, the balance of payments remained in a poor state and interest rates were still high.[83] Unemployment levels that had peaked to just over 3 million in the mid 1980s, had begun to fall marginally in 1986.

In a further attempt to restrict trade union behaviour, the Government introduced the 1988 Employment Act. It included: secret ballots for the election of union leaders allowed to take part by post; the right for a worker not to take part in strike action unless there is a secret ballot; attempts to prevent trade unions influencing employment policy; legal protection for union members not wanting to strike or cross picket lines; and a commissioner established to help members take action against unions. After 1987 high inflation was tackled by using high interest rates in order to dampen demand. However, in a Monday Club publication in March 1989, the Government was warned not to be too tight on inflation as it could be detrimental to the pound's entry to the ERM. The publication, produced by the Club's Economic Policy Group, was a second policy paper, Why We Need Bold Tax Cuts on March 14, written by Patrick Minford. This paper was similar to his previous paper Economic Strategy, in so far as it served to assess the Conservative government's economic policy framework, coupled with Minford's own recommendations which, he claimed, would enhance the economic successes already achieved by the government. The paper dealt with the issues of: inflation and budget surplus, where Minford praised the government to reduce the level of taxation. Minford argued that the government could reduce the tax bill by £10 billion, which could be made possible by the revenue

---

83. Marwick, op. cit., p.318.

gained from privatisation and from North Sea Oil.[84] Shortly after the publication of this leaflet, however, the Thatcher Government fell.

The Monday Club produced a vast amount of material on economic issues. The Club adopted a comprehensive approach on this aspect of its policy framework, establishing study groups on economics and taxation. Indeed, many of the Club's pamphlets on economics exhibit an expertise which is absent in many of its other publications. This is most easily demonstrated by those pamphlets written by Patrick Minford in the middle to late 1980s, Minford being a prominent figure in the field of liberal economics.

As we have seen, the Club exhibited a commitment to economic liberalism, by favouring policies such as reduced government spending, privatisation and free enterprise. There were, nonetheless, tensions within its economic liberalism with some Club members favouring incomes policy in the 1970s, regarding it as a solution to curbing inflation and some, as discussed earlier, describing it as "iniquitous". Gerald Howarth, when interviewed, suggested that the Monday Club was divided on economic policy. Most members were anti-price and incomes policies, however, Jonathan Guinness, Howarth stated, frequently supported price and incomes policies. Howarth claimed that this upset many Club members, however, he believed that

---

84. Patrick Minford, Why We Need Bold Tax Cuts on March 14, London: Monday Club, 1989, p.5.

Guinness was just following the 'Party line'.[85] Graham Webster-Gardiner, when interviewed, attested that the Club was not 'hot' on economics, and he suggested a possible division on economics within the Club's membership. Webster-Gardiner claimed that amongst the Club's membership were old-fashioned Tories who were not 'switched on' to free markets and young members who were libertarians. Therefore, he characterised the Club's economics as being libertarian with a traditional/paternalistic streak.[86]

Although the Club has clearly advocated economic liberalism, the Club was not liberal per se. As we have seen in the chapter four, the Club was opposed to the movement of labour across international boundaries. Consequently, a contradiction exists between the Club favouring free movement of capital and restrictive movement of people. In Monday World, winter 1972/3, "Inflation: why is ours so severe", it was argued that one of the reasons for Britain's high inflation was the declining population due to emigration. As a result of "A stationary or declining population finds itself faced with considerably increased per head 'overhead' expenses for government."[87] France and Germany, it was claimed, had both experienced dramatic economic expansion when their working population increased. Therefore, it was argued that Britain required a boost to its labour force if it was to rid the economy of

---

85. Interview with Gerald Howarth, 29th April 1998.

86. Interview with Graham Webster-Gardiner, 28th April 1998.

87. Monday World, Winter 1972/3, p.9.

inflation. Yet, how this was to be secured remained unclear. The brief mention of "guestworkers" was to say the least surprising considering the Club's stance on race and immigration.[88]

Patrick Seyd has suggested that the Club, when he carried out his study in the early 1970s, was authoritarian and showed signs of corporatism. He argued that in the 1970s there were inconsistencies in the Club's economic policy. But by the 1980s the Club did not demonstrate any affiliation to corporatism and the inconsistencies had died out. In addition, he held that the Club's attitude towards trade unions was at times inconsistent with it calling for a conscience clause for closed shops rather than a complete ban on closed shops and there was an inconsistency on exchange rates, some arguing for fixed and others for a sliding parity.[89]

The Club's different strands of economic thought could be a result of much its membership being free market libertarians, such as Graham Webster-Gardiner, who as a former member of the FCS has been open about his affiliation to libertarianism. The likes of John Biggs-Davison, who was a paternalist, believed that the role of the leadership was to protect the State not to bind it. Also amongst its membership were those who looked to more extreme forms of conservatism, as demonstrated by the articles in Monday World, previously discussed in chapter two, which exhibited sympathy for Charles Maurras and Antonio de Oliveira Salazar. Also in one issue of

---

88. Ibid.

89. Interview with Patrick Seyd, 17th May 1995.

Monday World, it was held that classical liberals in the Conservative Party were heartless capitalists who operated in "a social vacuum."[90] In "Bitter Harvest", David Edgar argued that the Monday Club displayed a "suspicion of free-market economics."[91] In some ways, we have seen, this is misleading. The Club could attract Patrick Minford. But it could also be led by Jonathan Guinness and contain sympathisers of Charles Maurras.

---

90. Monday World, Summer 1973, p.2.

91. Edgar, 1984, op. cit., p.41.

Chapter Six: Northern Ireland

"...the Monday Club - members in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland - is unshakeably resolved to support and maintain the Union of Ulster and mainland Britain. We did so at the moment of the Club's birth in 1961, we do so still and will go on doing so for as long as anyone can see into the future."[1]

The view expressed above by the Monday Club's then Chairman, David Storey, encapsulated the Club's policy on Northern Ireland. Although with its strongest roots in England (not least in its representation among MPs), the Club saw itself as defending the UK as a whole. It paid little attention to developments in Scotland or Wales that could be seen as threatening the political system it championed.[2] Its

---

1. David Storey, Wanted a Positive Policy for Ulster, London: Monday Club, 1988, p.3.

2. But a key feature of its commitment to the Union was a fervent opposition to Irish Nationalism. It is regrettable in this regard that while David Seawright's excellent study of Scottish Unionism discusses the development of the New Right within the Scottish party, he is mainly concerned with other developments and makes no reference to the Monday Club. See: David Seawright, An Importance Matter of Principle the Decline of the Scottish Conservative and Unionist Party, Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.

defence of the Union illustrates the Combative Tory stance discussed in the first chapter. This stance never faltered and was repeated throughout the Club's literature. From interviews conducted with past and present members of the Monday Club there is an agreement that Northern Ireland was a key issue for the Club; it was "...high on the agenda for most Monday Club members."[3]

In order to put the Club's policy into perspective, it is important first to draw attention to a number of crucial developments that resulted in the divisions between Protestants and Catholics in the province of Northern Ireland. By 1829, there was a movement within Ireland, which called for a repeal of the Union and wanted Home Rule (establishing an Irish Parliament and thus devolution from the UK). It was not initially welcomed by the British Parliament, but by the late 1880s, the Liberal Prime Minister, Gladstone, declared his support for Home Rule. A number of Home Rule Bills followed with the third Home Rule Bill being passed which allowed all but six predominantly Protestant counties of Ireland to have Home Rule. This was passed in 1914 but suspended due to the outbreak of World War I. From 1910-1920, Sir Edward Carson, the leader of the Ulster Unionists, fought to maintain the Union. The response of the Unionists was hostile to the point of training a paramilitary Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) to overthrow the Home Rule Bill. Despite continued attempts at persuasion by British Liberal Prime Ministers, they still remained opposed to the Bill's passage. On the other side, support for Home Rule came under challenge from

---

3. Interview with Andrew Hunter, 8th June 1998.

advocates of independence and a party which sought to break away from Britain, Sinn Fein, was formed in 1906. Also, at this time, the Irish Volunteers who were established to support Home Rule merged with a secret organisation, the Irish Brotherhood, to form the Irish Republican Army (IRA).

The fourth Home Rule Bill became the Government of Ireland Act 1920. As the British Government was unable to coerce the Unionists into accepting an all Ireland State, the Act (later termed the Partition Act) resulted in the separation of Ireland into a Northern State comprising of six counties and a twenty-six county Irish Free State, which was given dominion status. (The Irish Free State later became the Republic). Hence, two Governments were established, with the Southern Parliament being self-governing and the Northern State having a provincial Government at Stormont. The separation of Ulster from the rest of Ireland could be seen as a success for the Ulster Unionists who were opposed to Home Rule. However, it also resulted in the Southern Unionists being left outside the Union. In 1921 James Craig was inaugurated as the first Prime Minister of Northern Ireland and with the population of the six counties of the province predominantly Protestant, the Stormont Parliament was dominated by the Unionists. Thus, the State became characterised by sectarian majority rule. This was set to continue until the suspension of Stormont in 1972.

The politics of Ireland have been characterised by disruption and disunity. Hence, the 'troubles' experienced in Northern Ireland since the late 1960s have been preceded by several upsurges in violence. The origin of the conflict in Northern Ireland is a contested issue. It is all too easy to see the conflict as having been caused solely by religious differences. As Arthur Aughey has argued, "Religion is not the cause of the

divisions which are held to be real and material and not ideal and spiritual."[4] Furthermore, Catholic and Protestant have become easily identifiable labels for the different factions within the province; however, not all Catholics are Nationalists and likewise not all Protestants are Unionists.

Traditionally, Unionists hold the view that Ireland has never been a united nation They claim that they are a different breed of people from the Catholics, as they have a different identity, religion, culture, heritage and interests. Due to this belief, the Unionists argue that they have the right to self-determination and it is the Nationalists' (Nationalist is a term used to refer to all those in Ireland who favour Irish unity) failure to recognise this fact that has caused the conflict in the province.

During the period of devolved rule leading up to the so-called 'troubles', there was an unequal allocation of housing and public sector employment that worked against the Catholics, and the role of the so-called 'B' Specials also helped to generate Catholic grievances against Stormont rule. The 'B' specials were the Ulster Special Constabulary, a part time reserve force, which supported the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC), and it tended to attract those with Loyalist views (those militantly favouring British rule). Feelings of discrimination proliferated throughout the Catholic community. Although these feelings were present in the province from

---

4. Arthur Aughey, Under Siege: Ulster Unionism and the Anglo Irish Agreement, London: Hurst and Co., 1993, p.3.

the 1920s through to the 1960s, they were not strong enough to cause any mobilisation in the community. However, the Civil Rights Movement (CRM), which began in the mid-1960s, was successful in rallying support from different sections of the Northern Ireland population.

The events that culminated in the eventual abolition of Northern Ireland's Parliament began with the CRM disturbances. In October 1968 the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association (NICRA) led a demonstration on the housing issue in Derry. As it was held in defiance of the law, there was a large police presence and the conclusion to the demonstration was a full-scale riot. More disturbances followed, with Ulster Loyalists arranging counter demonstrations. The consequence of the pressure exerted on Stormont by the CRM was the announcement of reforms in November 1968. The reforms involved: fairer allocation of housing; non-discriminatory actions by local government; the withdrawal of the Special Powers Act (originally introduced in 1922 whereby the Minister of Home Affairs had the authority to permit internment and arrest without trial) and the introduction of a Parliamentary Commissioner for complaints. It was suggested by John Biggs-Davison, MP and other prominent members of the Monday Club that Terence O'Neill (the Prime Minister of Stormont) had been pressured into these reforms, not by Wilson, but by the threat of violence by the Nationalists. Consequently, Biggs-Davison commented, "Civil war is now thought possible within the UK. The bomb has become a political argument of Celtic Nationalism within these Islands."[5]

---

5. Monday Club Newsletter, May 1969, p.6.

Prior to the start of the troubles in the early 1970s, constitutional Unionism centred on the Ulster Unionist Party (UUP). However, with the mobilisation of the CRM in 1968 and the legislative reforms that followed to appease the Catholic community, the Unionist bloc began to fragment. The first demonstration of this was the sacking of William Craig, Home Affairs Minister (Stormont), who attacked the reforms. This was followed by the resignation of the Ulster Prime Minister, Terence O'Neill. He was forced to resign in April 1969, hence Stormont was dissolved in January 1969 and elections were held. The UUP secured just over 61% of the vote; however O'Neill faced opposition within his own Party from hard-line Unionists, notably William Craig and Brian Faulkner. Two months after the elections O'Neill resigned as PM and leader of the UUP, and was replaced by Major James Chichester-Clark.

The Unionists' reaction to the claims of discrimination by the CRM was to denounce them and attempt to disprove the allegations made against the administration. In Monday Club circles, reaction to Catholic claims of discrimination by the Protestant Government was one of disbelief. Thus, Club members declared that the notion of the oppressed Catholic minority was a myth propounded by the Republic and its propaganda machine.[6] Likewise, Unionists' response to the CRM often included an attempt at trying to discredit the movement, claiming that the CRM was a front for the IRA and therefore its goal was a united Ireland and not just equal rights for Catholics.

---

6. Monday News, May 1973, p.3.

The CRM, in the Club's view, was being encouraged to cause civil unrest by communists. Its 1970 pamphlet, Ireland Our Cuba, emphasised the radical right notion of a communist threat: "We must speak to Orange supporters as fellow-Conservatives and fellow-patriots to convince them that the danger does not come from the Pope or the Irish republic but is a common European danger; it is a communist revolution, the anarchy that leads to a deadly atheistic tyranny."[7] In the same way the Club had argued communism was a threat to stability in Southern Africa, it also believed that communism was the common enemy of the people of Ulster regardless of whether they were Catholic or Protestant: "we must carry the propaganda to the Nationalists", to prevent the spread of communism and ideas of a republic.[8] It also accused the Protestant extremists of damaging any possible settlement in the Province.[9]

The CRM demonstration proved to be a major embarrassment to Westminster, both nationally and internationally. This, in conjunction with a period of high unemployment and serious economic decline, led to British Government intervention in Northern Ireland financially, and Stormont found itself temporarily dependent upon the Labour Government. The CRM disturbances also resulted in the British Government sending the army into Northern Ireland on 12th August 1969, ostensibly as a temporary measure. The army in conjunction with the 'B' Specials and the RUC

---

7. Ireland Our Cuba?, London: Monday Club, 1970, p.4.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid.

had a peacekeeping role. By the end of 1969 Stormont had lost credibility and thus panic measures were introduced by the Government, such as an internment policy. Wilson's Labour Government was interested in promoting reforms in Northern Ireland, but Wilson had to 'tread' carefully on this matter due to the very slim majority held by Labour in the Commons, particularly as the Ulster Unionists traditionally voted with the Conservatives.

1970 heralded a change in Government on the mainland; however, little changed in Northern Ireland itself. However, a split in the IRA, between the gradualist (and Marxist) Official IRA and the more militant Provincial IRA (PIRA) resulted in increased violence. In February 1971, the first British soldier was killed by the PIRA and as a result Chichester Clarke called for more support from the British Government although failed to get it. Consequently, in March he resigned. Chichester Clarke was succeeded by the more hard-line Brian Faulkner. The situation in the Province worsened and on 9th August 1971, the British Government sent in more troops and an internment policy was implemented in all Catholic areas. In 1969 when the British army had been sent to Northern Ireland, the Catholics had been very welcoming but by 1971, the army was seen as a tool of the Unionists. This only served to fuel the Nationalist cause, as they were able to perpetuate the idea that the British imperialists had imposed an "army of occupation" on the Irish people.[10]

---

10. Tom Wilson, Ulster: Conflict and Consent, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989, p.160.

The same year, the Social Democratic and Labour Party (SDLP, a more moderate nationalist party) was established by Gerry Fitt and John Hume. The party was committed to a united Ireland, but it was willing to participate in power sharing as long as the Irish Government was involved.

1971 also saw deepening divisions within Unionism with the establishment of the Ulster Defence Association (UDA). This organisation was designed to fill the gap that had been left once the exclusively Protestant 'B' Specials had been disbanded in April 1970. The UDA was comprised of Protestant vigilantes and became a channel for young Loyalists to vent their frustrations. The Club as a whole did not express an opinion on the UDA. However, individual members did comment on the nature of this organisation. For example, D.F McDonough, the Director of Research of the Oxford University branch of the Monday Club, in Monday News May 1973, proclaimed that the UDA, unlike the IRA, were not indiscriminate murderers. The UDA, it was suggested, were defending its rights, as the British Government had repeatedly left the Unionists disenchanted with their ineffectual policies. Hence, the UDA were seen as an organisation reacting to the failings of Westminster.[11]

In October 1971, Ian Paisley and Desmond Boal announced the formation of the Democratic Unionist Party (DUP). The Party was comprised of evangelical Protestants and was linked to Paisley's Free Presbyterian Church. Another Unionist Party, the Vanguard Unionist Party (VUP), formed by William Craig, the former

---

11. Monday News, May 1973, p.3.

Northern Ireland Home Affairs Minister, was established in February 1972. Its principal aim was to rid Northern Ireland of its Nationalist enemy. Thus, Craig was prepared to advocate violence in order to achieve this end. Although the VUP was originally committed to the maintenance of the Union, the defeat of terrorism was higher on its agenda than the preservation of the Union: "We would prefer to maintain the Union but the desire *must be reciprocated, and the pledges must be accompanied* by a powerful parliament in Northern Ireland, to resist all attacks and to defeat the inevitable recurring terrorist onslaughts virtually guaranteed to take place by the success of the present (IRA) attack. If there is not to be this strength in the UK we would prefer to be outside the UK, seeking no special treatment but expecting at least the same consideration as the anti-British South when it opted out."[12] At a Monday Club meeting in October 1972, Craig stated that he was able to mobilise 80,000 men to oppose the British Government. He also said, "We are prepared to come out and shoot and kill. I am prepared to kill and those behind me will have my full support."[13]

The following month, the Club's publication, Monday News, carried an article "Craig: the Man and His Future." The article included comments on the speech Craig had made to the Club. It was suggested that this stance indicated that the Loyalists had their breaking point, thus implying that Unionists were justified in using violence

---

12. Paul Bew and Gordon Gillespie, Northern Ireland: A Chronology of the Troubles 1968-1993, Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1993, p.62.

13. The Times, 20th October 1972, p.2.

as all other options had failed. The article concluded by prophesising that the leader of Northern Ireland would be someone like Craig who would take a firm stance on terrorism. Although the author did not state that he supported Craig, he did indicate clear sympathy for the policies adopted by the Vanguard leader.[14]

Monday News, however, subsequently published a response where it was claimed that where the above article had justified Craig's actions, the Vanguard leader's call for violence was the type of extremism that had resulted in the troubles in Northern Ireland. The article included comments on the suggestion that Craig or someone like Craig would become leader of the province. For the author, Craig was "...an uncompromising man who has the interests of only a section of the people at heart. He would not be acceptable to anyone who desires peace in Northern Ireland."[15] The Executive Council of the Monday Club, however, made no comment on any of the individual Unionist Parties.

With the Club exhibiting support for Unionist organisations, it is not surprising that it was fervently opposed to Irish Nationalism and it consistently condemned the activities of the IRA. In a Club Newsletter in 1972, an article titled, "Ulster: We Must Lead", put forward policy suggestions on how the Government should handle the IRA. These included a ban on reporting what the IRA and Sinn Fein had to say. It was

14. Monday News, November 1972, p.4.

15. Monday News, February 1973, p.12.

also suggested that once reporting restrictions had been imposed, the next step for the Government would be to outlaw the IRA.[16] (The IRA was illegal in Northern Ireland but not on the British mainland). The same year, the IRA announced a temporary truce that led to talks between the Secretary of State, William Whitelaw, and the IRA leadership. However, very little resulted from the meeting and the truce was quickly ended. The Club's reaction to this was publicised in Monday News, July 1972, which made clear that it had never held any store by the IRA's promises of any cessation of violence. Thus the article mocked the Government for its belief that the IRA was willing to come to a compromise, as the article said, "we told you so."[17]

The Club's condemnation of the tactics employed by the IRA remained constant. Its view was put succinctly in an article later that year. The IRA, it declared, was a thoroughly evil organisation that had to be destroyed. In addition, the Heath Government's policy on the IRA was strongly criticised as being ineffective, particularly, it argued, as interned terrorists were being released and moving freely across the Irish border. It was suggested that the Government was failing to act against the IRA because it did not want to attract bad publicity; "Was political expediency, in the form of wishing to avoid adverse press comment, put above the long term political and moral necessity of defeating the IRA?"[18]

---

16. Monday Club Newsletter, March 1972, p.1.

17. Monday News, July 1972, p.3.

18. Monday News, September 1972, p.5.

By 1972, the effects of the internment policy and the presence of British troops were resulting in an escalation of violence in the province. "Bloody Sunday" on 30th January 1972, in which 13 civilians were shot dead by the British Army, received international condemnation. In an act of retaliation, the British Embassy in Dublin was burnt down and the Irish Ambassador in London vacated his post. Not surprisingly IRA reprisals followed with incidents such as the so-called "Bloody Friday", July 22nd 1972, in which bombs were planted in Belfast, which led to three civilians being killed. The conclusion to the disastrous internment policy and the events of "Bloody Sunday" was the withdrawal of Stormont's power over Northern Ireland's security policy. Stormont was suspended on 24th March 1972. The following day William Whitelaw was asked by Heath to become Secretary of State for Northern Ireland. The Club's immediate response was expressed by Sir Victor Raikes in the Daily Telegraph: "The British Government presented Mr Faulkner with an ultimatum involving direct rule which no self-respecting Prime Minister could have possibly accepted under the circumstances...Mr Heath's new scheme will doubtless receive the overwhelming support of both sides of the House... if I were still in Parliament I should... oppose it without hesitation."[19]

In June 1972 William Whitelaw agreed to hold talks with the SDLP, having earlier that year refused to meet the PIRA. At the meeting the SDLP put forward conditions wanted by the PIRA. The main condition was to grant political status to Republican

---

19. Copping, 1975, op. cit., p.5.

prisoners, thereby making them prisoners of war, which in turn would allow for more visits and for the wearing of civilian clothes. This was agreed upon by Whitelaw and was known as special category status.

That same month, the Monday Club's Ulster group produced a pamphlet, Ulster in Your Hands. This was sent to the Conservative Party Chairman, Lord Carrington. It called for the increase in the representation for Northern Ireland in Westminster, and no obligation to increase minority parties on the Northern Ireland Executive.[20]

Just as the Club provided a venue for Craig's support for violence, so too it sympathised with the UDA. This was further highlighted when in August 1972, the Sunday Telegraph carried an article regarding arms running to the UDA by some London Monday Club members. Special Branch was investigating these members, it claimed. The Club's director, Michael Woolrych argued that he was not aware of this declaring that "These allegations concern an extremist group which is acting secretly. Other members are unaware of the activity."[21] John Gadd, a Monday Club member and member of the NF, was subsequently convicted for gun running for the UDA and received a ten year jail sentence.[22]

---

20. CCO 20/43/6, Ulster in Your Hands, London: Monday Club, 1972.

21. Sunday Telegraph, 20th August 1972.

22. Searchlight, June 1987, p.15.

At the Conservative Party Conference in October 1972, Brian Faulkner, leader of the UUP was a speaker at a Monday Club fringe meeting. The main focus of the speech was to defeat the terrorists using security forces. In addition, he, like the Club, was concerned by the fact that the IRA was not banned on the British mainland.[23]

By the end of 1972, Direct Rule had been imposed. Stormont was eventually abolished in the Northern Ireland Constitution Act 1973 which in turn established an executive administration comprised of a Secretary of State and a Ministerial Team. The Conservative Cabinet found itself divided on the issue of Direct Rule prior to its imposition, although once it was introduced, Whitelaw's administration received cross party support. The abolition of Stormont brought an end to fifty years of Protestant majority rule in Northern Ireland. For some in the Monday Club, the suspension of Stormont was tantamount to the suspension of democracy in Northern Ireland. Hence, the Club's opinion on the imposition of Direct Rule was, in general, disparaging. However, some members regarded it as the only option due to the level of violence in the Province, suggesting that it was the only way to avoid more bloodshed and should have been introduced in 1969 when the troubles began.[24]

Following the imposition of Direct Rule, the UUP split over a Government White Paper, produced in March 1973. The Paper, Northern Ireland Constitutional Proposals, put forward proposals for a Northern Ireland Assembly and for the

---

23. The Times, 14th October 1972, p.5.

24. Tomeki, op. cit., p.12.

Secretary of State to act as a mediator between the parties to negotiate the prospect of a power-sharing executive. The White Paper was voted upon by the Ulster Unionist Council (the governing body of the UUP) and was agreed. Certain sections of the UUP, however, were unwilling to compromise and enter into such an agreement.

The White Paper included an Irish element, which involved Ireland's Taoiseach, Jack Lynch, in the discussions. The White Paper resulted in the Sunningdale Agreement, which proposed a Northern Ireland Assembly with an Irish dimension. For many Unionists this was unacceptable. Even Brian Faulkner, who entered into the talks at Sunningdale from which the power-sharing executive was formed, said in April 1973; "We are not opposed to power-sharing in Government, but we will not be prepared to participate in Government with those whose primary aim is to break the Union with Great Britain."[25]

Those Unionists who remained within the UUP were to stand in the first elections for the Northern Ireland Assembly in June 1973. Those who were in support for the White Paper stood as 'Official Unionist' and those who were opposed to the White Paper stood as 'Unionists'. A United Ulster Unionist Council (UUUC) was established in December 1973, specifically to oppose any attempts at power sharing, which included members from the DUP and the VUP.

---

25. Bew and Gillespie, op. cit., p.63.

Following the elections to the Assembly, the UUP, the SDLP and the Alliance Party (established in 1970 as an attempt to unite sections of the Catholic and Protestant communities) met for talks on the prospect for a devolved power-sharing executive. The UUP's discussions with Nationalists only served to further alienate Faulkner from the body of the Party. The Sunningdale Conference, which took place in December 1973, resulted in the establishment of a Council of Ireland, which he saw as having only an advisory role. However, the SDLP saw it as a step towards a united Ireland. Although it was not clearly stated as to what areas the Council would be involved in, it was agreed by Heath that it would have a say in the policing of the province. Therefore, the UUP regarded itself as the loser in the Agreement, which resulted in Faulkner's resignation from its leadership in January 1974.

The following year, anti-Sunningdale Agreement Unionists merged temporarily with the UDA and some other paramilitaries to form the Ulster Workers Council (UWC). The UWC mobilised a general strike that lasted 14 days. It was their intention to force the Unionists within the power-sharing executive to withdraw. After the 14 days, Faulkner withdrew his members from the executive, which resulted in its collapse. The strike received massive support from Protestants, although certainly intimidation did take place. The leader of the movement and thus a main contributor to the bringing down of the council was William Craig. After the victory of the anti-power sharing Unionists, the UUUC was disbanded.

For the Monday Club, power-sharing was not a viable option. The Club's most prolific speaker on Northern Ireland, John Biggs-Davison, expressed its stance on the province most succinctly in an article published in Monday News in the latter part of

1973. He argued that power sharing was not a viable solution, as there would be antagonistic parties within the power-sharing body. Hence, for him, as for the majority of the Club, the solution to the governing of Northern Ireland was either provincial self-government or integration. With regard to the Conservative Party's relationship with the Ulster Unionists, Biggs-Davison had argued in the same article that to have a Conservative view of Ulster was tantamount to being Unionist. He therefore suggested it was somewhat ironic that it was Conservative policy that had destroyed the relationship between the Conservatives and the Unionists: "the Mother of Parliament strangled its daughter", the Government had played into the Republicans' hands and betrayed the Unionists.[26]

During the latter part of 1973 a number of Monday Club MPs called for the Conservative Government to impose a ban on the IRA, just as the Club had done the previous year. John Biggs-Davison argued that "It is not easy for rank-and-file Conservatives to understand why the IRA was proscribed in the whole of Ireland but not in England, Wales and Scotland... The IRA is not just an opinion – it is a political mafia, in arms against the people of the British Isles."[27] Jill Knight complained that the IRA was "at open war with Britain"[28]

---

26. Monday News, November/December 1973, p.2.

27. Copping, 1975, op. cit., pp.9-10.

28. Ibid., p.9.

Although, in the mid 1970s the main concern of the Club was power-sharing, the supposed proliferation of Communism in Northern Ireland continued to be frequently referred to by various members. In April 1974, an article titled "Ulster: The Front Line", was published in Monday News. It stated that the Communists tried to infiltrate countries where divisions existed, whether they were religious, racial or cultural divisions. It was suggested that they did this by targeting the subversive element in that society and then through propaganda helped to create more of a division in the community.[29]

The blame for the imposition of Direct Rule, as far as the Club was concerned, lay firmly with Edward Heath. As we have seen in previous chapters, the Club's criticism of Heath's administration ran far deeper than just a dislike of the policy on Northern Ireland. With regard to his stance on Northern Ireland the Monday Club was highly antagonistic, not least because it believed Heath was responsible for the abolition of Stormont, but he was also criticised for his negotiations with the Republic. Hence, the Club suggested that Heath's Government put its negotiations with the Republic above the safety of the people in Northern Ireland.[30]

The Heath administration was succeeded by Harold Wilson's Labour government in 1974. Shortly after a White Paper was published, The Northern Ireland Constitution,

---

29. Monday News, April 1974, pp.6-7.

30. Philip Whitehead, The Writing on the Wall: Britain in the Seventies, London: Michael Joseph Ltd, 1985, p.102.

which contained proposals for a constitutional convention, its role being to discuss the future government of Northern Ireland. Power sharing was still seen as a viable option despite the collapse, just a few months earlier, of the Council of Ireland.

Although the Ulster Unionists remained as a party after the imposition of Direct Rule, it did experience a decline in its popularity, while the DUP found itself in a stronger position. Faulkner's Unionist Party of Northern Ireland (UPNI) received little support and after his death in 1976 became a spent force while in 1977 the VUP was dissolved. Hence, the realignment of Unionist politics left only two main Unionist Parties: the DUP and the UUP. The UUP's approach to power sharing was in general hostile. Faulkner's acceptance of power sharing sounded the death knell to his leadership of the UUP. Harry West, who succeeded Faulkner, was opposed to power sharing, as was James Molyneaux who became the Ulster Unionist leader in 1976.

In early 1977, during discussion between James Molyneaux and the Labour Government, Molyneaux put forward a proposal for the devolution of Administration and the creation of a legislative body or an upper house in local government to deal with administrative issues. The following year, Airey Neave (Conservative Party spokesperson on Northern Ireland), who was formulating a new policy on the Province, declared that power-sharing was not "practical politics", and that a future Conservative Administration would "support the Ulster Unionists' proposals for an upper tier to local administration."[31] Hence, in the 1979 Conservative Party General

---

31. Bew and Gillespie, op. cit., p.126.

Election Manifesto, proposals included that Ireland would be integrated with the UK and an elected body would be established in the province that would deal with local Government issues. However, in March 1979 Airey Neave was murdered by the Irish National Liberation Army (INLA), (a militant breakaway from the Official IRA which was established in 1975).

Once the Conservatives were in power in 1979, the issue of the loss of the special category status was brought to the fore of Northern Ireland politics. By late 1980, a number of Republican prisoners went on hunger strike. Under the new administration, the first step towards an attempt at constitutional change in Northern Ireland occurred in 1980 with the so-called Atkins Talks (named after the Secretary of State, Humphrey Atkins). The talks involved discussions with the DUP, the SDLP and the Alliance Party in an attempt to come to some agreement over the governing of Northern Ireland. However, the talks failed to establish any agreement between the parties. The UUP boycotted the talks as it regarded them as yet another attempt at power sharing.

The Government received much criticism from the Monday Club Executive following a condition included in a Government White Paper ("Proposals for Further Discussion"), published in July 1980. The condition was that the minority in the province would be taken into account at all times. In Monday News, early 1981, a letter that had been sent to the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland from the Club's Deputy Chairman, David Storey, was printed. It was suggested that it would be undemocratic to take account of the minority, as in other parts of Britain minorities existed but no special arrangements were set up for them. In addition, it was argued

that as long as democratic elections were held, it could not be helped if one section of the community lost out.[32] The reply to the letter was made by Michael Alison (Minister of State for Northern Ireland), who stated that the Government was trying to achieve stability and peace in the province and this could not be done through the electoral process, due to Northern Ireland having a permanent minority. The Monday Club's letter had also raised the charge of communist infiltration in the Nationalist movement. A recommendation that the Government should cancel the Anglo-Soviet Consular Convention of 1965, thus preventing the USSR from opening a consulate in a contentious place such as Belfast, was put forward. In response to this suggestion, Alison claimed there would be no advantages from enforcing this type of action, as there was no evidence that the Russians had involved themselves in any of the Irish Nationalists' subversive activities.[33]

Similarly, at the beginning of the eighties, in an article by John Biggs-Davison, "The Strategic Implications for the West of the International Links of the IRA in Ireland", it was alleged that Irish Nationalists received support, money and propaganda from 'communist powers'. Biggs-Davison also restated that the IRA's revolutionary model was Cuba, thus Irish Nationalists were aiming towards a socialist workers' republic.[34]

In September 1981, James Prior, who replaced Humphrey Atkins as Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, put forward favoured proposals for rolling devolution, whereby

---

32. Monday News, March 1981, p.25.

33. Ibid., pp.24-26.

34. Ibid.

power would gradually be handed over to a provincial government assembly when cross community co-operation was established. This was put forward in a Government White Paper, Northern Ireland: A Framework for Devolution, published in April 1982 which despite the proposals put forward in the White Paper, the Government's stance on Northern Ireland at this stage was not necessarily clear cut. In the House of Commons on 29th July 1982, Mrs Thatcher stated that, "No commitments exist on Her Majesty's Government to consult the Irish Government on matters affecting Northern Ireland."[35] This was said, even though discussions had been taking place between the British and Irish Prime Ministers in summits in May and December. The Northern Ireland Act was introduced in 1982, which established an Assembly to formulate proposals for rolling devolution. This received limited support, with the Ulster Unionists and the SDLP opposing it. The Assembly elections of October 1982 were boycotted by the SDLP and Sinn Fein.

The Club's reaction to the Northern Ireland Act of 1982 was not favourable. In a policy paper, Proposal for a Constitutional Settlement, produced by K.Harvey Proctor, William Ross, John Pinniger and John de Vere Walker, it was argued that the Act would only serve to alienate the Unionists further from the Conservative Party. The Paper called for the Government to learn from its past mistakes, primarily that power sharing did not work. It was recommended that the elections to the Northern Ireland Assembly be postponed. As an alternative, the Club suggested, as before, that the Government adopt a more powerful local government structure. As a reminder to the

---

35. House of Commons Debates, vol. 28, col. 1226, 29th July 1982.

Government of its previous policy commitments, the Paper concluded with a quote from the 1979 Conservative Party Election Manifesto: "We do not believe that a more ambitious scheme to devolve executive and legislative powers to Northern Ireland would be successful in present conditions. In our view...the talk of recreating political stability should begin fairly modestly with the establishment of a new framework of local government which the Province has lacked during the last few years."[36] The Northern Ireland Assembly was abolished in 1985.

In a Club Policy Paper, Out! Out! Out!, produced by the Club's Northern Ireland Policy Committee in August 1985, the Club called for a change of approach by the Conservatives: "The least we can do to support Northern Ireland is to end all talk of a United Ireland and deal in the reality of the present."[37] It recommended that the Government show its commitment to the Union of Northern Ireland and Britain; consequently, it called for the Irish Republic Government to drop "its claim to constitutional sovereignty over Northern Ireland."[38]

In response to both external pressures from the USA and the EC (who were concerned that the situation in Northern Ireland was developing into civil war) and Sinn Fein's electoral pressure on the SDLP (there was a real prospect that Sinn Fein was going to

---

36. DPW/40/25, Proposals for a Constitutional Settlement, London: Monday Club, 1982, p.3.

37. DPW/40/24, Out! Out! Out!, London: Monday Club, 1985, p.2.

38. Ibid., p.4.

overtake the SDLP as the leading Nationalist movement in Northern Ireland), Mrs Thatcher had to formulate a new initiative on the province. The result was the introduction of the Anglo-Irish Agreement (AIA) in November 1985. The AIA was designed to work towards achieving cross community support for devolution. An Irish Dimension was included in the AIA, however, giving the Irish Government more input in the governing of Northern Ireland through inter-governmental conferences, while rejecting any suggestion of a joint authority of Northern Ireland between the British and Irish Parliaments.

The Unionists were not consulted at any stage of the drawing up of the Agreement. They regarded the AIA as a way of attempting to 'coerce' them into accepting a power-sharing devolved Government, coupled with an Irish dimension and consequently opposed it. In conclusion, a former Irish Minister, (who was not named), said the Agreement "Constitutes a deal between the Irish Catholics and the British at the expense of Irish Protestants in their "Ulster" bastion...accompanied by a great deal of verbiage about "reconciling the two traditions" in Northern Ireland."[39]

Following the signing of the AIA, Mrs Thatcher said her reason for accepting the agreement was "...because I was not prepared to tolerate a situation of continuing violence."[40] However, due to the dissatisfaction felt by the Loyalist paramilitaries over

---

39. Brendan O'Leary and John McGarry, The Politics of Antagonism: Understanding Northern Ireland, London: The Athlone Press, 1993, p.223.

40. Bew and Gillespie, op. cit., p.188.

the AIA there was an escalation of violence and consequently, retaliation followed from Nationalist paramilitaries. Both leading Unionist parties were equally scathing in their remarks on the Agreement. In the House of Commons, on 26th November, the UUP leader and Monday Club member, James Molyneaux said of the AIA: "The agreement will bring not peace, but a sword...I have to say honestly and truthfully that in 40 years in public life I have never known what I can only describe as a universal cold fury which some of us have thus far managed to contain."[41]

The Unionists' continual opposition to the AIA came as a surprise to the Government who had not expected such a raging response. There was an attempt at some sort of compromise between the two Unionist leaders, Molyneaux and Paisley, and Mrs Thatcher, in February 1986. The discussions were on the AIA and the prospect of devolution. However, the Unionist leaders still regarded the AIA as an act of betrayal and an attempt to rid Britain of its responsibility towards Northern Ireland. Hence, they decided that no more talks would take place with the British Government until the AIA was dropped.

Following the signing of the AIA, a group was established within the Conservative Party called "Friends of the Union". The purpose of the group was to "Increase knowledge and understanding within and without the UK of the need to maintain the Union of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" and to attract membership "from those

---

41. Ibid., p.192.

who have a commitment to the integrity of the UK", and those "who seek to establish full and equal standards of citizenship for the people of Northern Ireland within the UK."[42]

The principal members of the group were the Monday Club's Sir John Biggs-Davison and Treasury Minister, Ian Gow. The group produced pamphlets that propounded the notion of integration. Biggs-Davison concentrated on rebutting the claim that Catholics desired a united Ireland and thus integration would serve to harm their interests. He argued that this notion was a fallacy: "They would not be threatened by integration...the lesson of Stormont is that Catholics are safer under Westminster."[43] (Biggs-Davison, himself, was a Catholic).

From the Monday Club's perspective, the AIA was yet another disastrous policy. Hence not surprisingly they were united with the Unionists in their opposition to the Agreement. The Club's approach to the issue was discussed in Right Ahead, Summer 1986, in an article "Rock Firm For The Union", which was based on a submission made by Sir John Biggs-Davison to the Northern Ireland Assembly in January 1986. He observed that he had opposed the Northern Ireland Bill at all stages of its passage through the House of Commons, due to the fact that he believed that Northern Ireland was being treated differently from the rest of the UK. For Biggs-Davison the AIA

---

42. Aughey, op. cit., pp.144-145.

43. Friends of the Union, Ulster Catholics and the Union, cited in Ibid.

signified a further separation between the UK and Northern Ireland, as it conferred upon the province a status that was more appropriate to a colony. In addition, he stated that "According to the Taoiseach the Agreement gives Dublin as near joint authority as can be."[44] Hence, like the Unionists in Northern Ireland, Biggs-Davison saw the Agreement as signifying some sort of 'sell-out' of the Unionists to the Irish Republic.

The issue of the AIA was also raised by the Monday Club in a Policy Paper, Wanted a Positive Policy for Ulster, by David Storey (the Club's Chairman). The foreword was written by George Gardiner, MP, who suggested that the AIA had torn the Conservative Party in two, due to divided loyalties to the PM and to Ulster. Whichever side they supported, the Conservatives in general, Gardiner claimed, knew that the AIA was doomed to failure. Thus, it was recommended that the Government realise that its policy was doomed, in order for it to embark on a more practical solution to the troubles in the Province.[45]

In the body of the pamphlet Storey argued that Heath had alienated the Ulster Unionists from the Conservative Party, thus undoing the Conservative and Unionist tradition. He declared that the administrations that followed Heath had been equally unsuccessful in their policies on the province, the result being that "People of the

---

44. Right Ahead, Summer, 1986, p.2.

45. Storey, 1988, op. cit., p.2.

Province have been left to flounder by successive flushes of politicians who have fumbled and stumbled from one ridiculous expedient to another".[46]

As an alternative to the AIA, Storey recommended that the Government make a firm declaration for a commitment to the Union. In conjunction with this, he also suggested that the 1973 Northern Ireland Act be amended where it stated that there would be no change in the status of Northern Ireland "unless a majority of its citizens so decide", as he claimed that it left an avenue of hope for the terrorists.[47] Storey continued in a highly impassioned manner and spoke of what he envisaged the future of Northern Ireland to be: "Ulster is not for the dark; a new Ulster will rise like a phoenix from the ashes to which the old was reduced by ineptitude, myopia and weakness."[48]

Paisley and Molyneaux, still opposed to the AIA, met for talks in 1986 and a general strike was held in March 1986 in protest to the AIA. By 1987 the two leaders met with the British Government to put forward an alternative to the AIA. Ideas that were suggested included a devolved power-sharing administration and increased integration with the UK. However, these policy ideas were not formalised.

With atrocities such as the IRA bomb at Enniskillen on Remembrance Day November1987, and the shooting dead of three members of the IRA by the SAS in

---

46. Ibid., pp.3-8.

47. Ibid., pp.7-8.

48. Ibid.

Gibraltar in March 1988, the AIA appeared to have created more problems. In fact the AIA did not provide any lasting solutions to the problems in Northern Ireland and acts of terrorism and violence continued. In 1989 a new Secretary of State for Northern Ireland was appointed, Peter Brooke MP. Within months of becoming Secretary of State he announced a desire to hold talks with Sinn Fein. He continued to appeal for talks not only with Republicans but also with the Unionists, in order to deal with the problems that had arisen with the AIA.

Despite the different approaches taken by the Conservative Government on Northern Ireland, the Monday Club had remained consistent in its approach and there is no evidence to suggest that it was ever divided in its support for Unionism. However, individual members have held differing opinions on aspects of the conflict. The most important division here has been how the Government of the province should be organised. While some members advocated integration, with others it was not so popular, hence another possible solution to the governing of the province offered by the Club was devolution on a par with Stormont. However, the Monday Club was not in favour of some of the propositions put forward by the more 'radical' Unionists, such as William Craig, who called for the introduction of a Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI), shortly after he broke away from the UUP in 1971. But there have been differing opinions too over details of security policy. For example, a tension in the Club's policy on Northern Ireland was with regard to the army. In a Club Newsletter in 1972, it was suggested that the army should be withdrawn from the province.[49] This was reiterated in Monday News in early 1973, when it was

---

49. Monday Club Newsletter, July 1972, p.1.

proposed that internal security be established by local units.[50] In Monday News, later in the year, it was argued that the army was ineffective, as terrorists were able to pass in and out of the province. The reason given for the ineffectual nature of the army was the fact that it was answerable to Westminster.[51]

But this has been the extent of disagreement. The Club has always remained committed to the general Unionist ideology, of preserving the Union between Northern Ireland and Britain and being vehemently opposed to Irish Nationalism, as is demonstrated by the membership of James Molyneaux (the leader of the UUP). The drive to preserve the Union illustrates not only the Club's Combative Tory element but it also demonstrates the pertinence of Freeden's definition of Conservatism as discussed in the first chapter, whereby Conservatives will resist any radical or extreme change. The Club maintained its opposition to the Sunningdale Agreement and the AIA, seeing them as further attempts by the British Government to break up the Union. It was also concerned with the impact these agreements had on the Unionist Parties, as following the imposition of the AIA in 1985, the DUP, under the leadership of Ian Paisley, became more sympathetic to the argument of a separate Unionist State, as it became very distrustful of Britain.

For the Club, the maintenance of the Union was paramount. Its importance was expressed frequently in its literature. For example, an article by D.F.McDonough,

---

50. Monday News, February 1973, p.10.

51. Monday News, June 1973, p.7.

argued that Britain was responsible for Ulster's future. The British people should "not look the other way...it is that majority's wishes which is our responsibility - their future is our future - their integrity is our integrity - their crisis of identity is our crisis of identity - the threats to civilised life that they have endured is as much our responsibility as theirs. The bare political facts which neither this Government nor the last have seen fit to face up to and act upon."[52] This article summed up the Club's approach to Northern Ireland, combining as it did a view of the province as a perpetual part of the UK and a critique of the Government's way of dealing with 'the troubles'.

---

52. Monday News, May 1973, p.3.

Chapter Seven: Europe

The origins of the European Community (EC) can be found before the establishment of the Monday Club. However, Britain's entry to the EC was negotiated at a time when the Monday Club was undergoing rapid growth in membership. Although as we have seen in previous chapters, the Club is committed to nationalism, which could lend itself to a policy opposed to EC membership, this was not necessarily the case. Like the main political parties, as will be discussed further in this chapter, the Club found itself divided on the issue of Britain's entry to the EC and as a result found it hard to establish a policy that would satisfy all of its members

It is not the intention of this chapter to give a detailed history of the origins of the EC; however, in order to put the Club's stance into perspective it is essential to outline the key events that resulted in the development of the EC. The conclusion to World War II is generally regarded as providing the impetus for discussions on the concept of a unified Europe. In Zurich in 1946, Winston Churchill spoke of his "...vision of a kind of United Europe with the United Kingdom, the British Commonwealth and the United States as friends and sponsors of the new Europe."[1] This notion of a United Europe was not acted upon until 1949, when Western European countries concluded that there was a need for some sort of political alliance. The result of these discussions was the establishment of a consultative parliamentary assembly known as the Council of Europe, which can be

---

1. Edward Nevin, The Economics of Europe, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1990, p.12.

regarded as the forerunner to the European Community (EC).[2] At that time the members of the Council did not believe that their purpose was to set up a permanent and more encompassing European Union; however, the Council of Europe was used as a forum for negotiation for European co-operation. The first stage occurred in August 1950, when the Council passed proposals (which were not, however ratified) for a common defence programme, the European Defence Community (EDC). This was essentially due to the initiative of Jean Monnet (who is regarded as the founding father of the development of the EC). In addition, on 9th May 1950 proposals for the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) were drafted and presented to the western European states. The ECSC was a supranational body, established with a High Authority (of which Monnet became the first President) which meant that its policy superseded that of the member states' governments. This aspect of the ECSC, in particular, provoked hostility within the British political establishment, with the Labour Government being opposed to the idea of a High Authority. So too did the Conservative opposition. Harold Macmillan, whilst addressing the Council of Europe in Strasbourg in 1950, stated that: "One thing is certain and we may as well face it. Our people will not hand over to any supranational authority the right to close down our pits and our steelworks."[3]

The signatories of the Treaty of Paris on 18th April 1951, through which the ECSC was inaugurated, were France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Belgium and the Netherlands. For Monnet, the ECSC was to be the initial stage in the development of an

2. Ibid., p.5.

3. Ibid., p.15.

all-encompassing and fully integrated Europe. Proposals for a common market were discussed at the Messina Conference in June 1955, whereby it was decided to form a community that would cover all areas of economic activity. Britain was present at the start of these discussions, but when it was made clear that the proposed organisations would involve elements of supranationalism, it withdrew from the Conference. By 1956, a committee established at the Messina Conference put forward proposals for the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM), its purpose being to develop and exploit nuclear energy, and the European Economic Community (EEC), whose role was to create economic union through the development of common trade practices.

Despite objections, in January 1958 the EEC and EURATOM Commissions were established under the Treaties of Rome. By 1965 there was an agreement to merge the EEC, EURATOM and the ECSC to form the European Community (EC); in April of that year the six original members signed the merger treaty, which came into effect in 1967. As noted above, the EEC contained elements of supranationalism; however, the French, under de Gaulle, were opposed to supranationalism. Hence, by 1965, intergovernmentalism was more prominent, whereby governments co-operated to formulate an agreed policy rather than be dictated to by a High Authority.

At this stage of the EC's development, Britain still remained aloof from the prospect of joining the European Community and in 1957 she refused to become a member of the newly formed EEC. This was despite the fact that Britain was experiencing poor economic growth and had lost a proportion of her Empire. However, in response to the

establishment of the EEC, Britain aided the formation of a different organisation, namely the European Free Trade Area (EFTA), inaugurated in 1960. EFTA was designed to promote free trade in industrial products amongst its seven members (none of whom were part of the EEC) Austria, Denmark, UK, Norway, Sweden, Portugal and Switzerland. This organisation involved only trade agreements and no "pooling of sovereignty."[4]

Britain's reluctance to enter the EEC led to Jean Monnet making the comment in the late 1950s: "There is one thing you British will never understand; an idea. And there is one thing you are supremely good at grasping: a hard fact. We will have to build Europe without you; but then you will join us."[5]

However, the Government's stance on Europe was set to change in the early 1960s. In November 1961 Harold Macmillan, who had held office since 1957, and had previously spoken out against Europe, attempted to open negotiations with the EEC in order to gain entry. He stated that this application to join the EEC was "a radical almost revolutionary step."[6] One of the reasons for the turn-about in Macmillan's attitude on Europe was the

---

4. Brian Brivati and Harriet Jones, From Reconstruction to Integration: Britain and Europe Since 1945, London: Leicester University Press, 1993, p.103.

5. Nevin, op. cit., p.15.

6. Brivati and Jones, op. cit., p.144.

economic climate that prevailed throughout his term of office. As we have seen in the chapter on Economics, in the 1960s Britain's economy was performing poorly compared to its European counter-parts. Therefore, the EEC was thought to hold the solutions to Britain's economic ills. In addition, commentators have suggested other factors in Britain's approach to the EEC, namely Britain's special relationship with the US and Britain's influence within the Commonwealth, which were both under threat at that time.

The special relationship with the USA, developed during the Second World War, was of great importance to successive Conservative Prime Ministers. The main area of interest had been defence and by 1960 Britain and the US entered into a partnership on the development of nuclear weapons, as well as America agreeing to sell nuclear missiles to Britain. However, this deal on the Skybolt air missile system was cancelled in 1962 due to faults with the system. This gave the French hope that Britain would enter into an agreement with France on nuclear weapons, which in de Gaulle's opinion would have shown Britain's commitment to Europe. However, the British Prime Minister, Harold Macmillan then went on to make an agreement with the US on Polaris submarine missiles. Meanwhile, with regard to Britain's application to join the EEC, President Kennedy was encouraging Macmillan to join in order to prevent "French domination" and to create a third force in world politics.[7] The political pressure being applied by the US has led Stephen George and Matthew Sowemimo to comment in Contemporary

---

7. Stephen George and Mathew Sowemimo, 'Conservative Foreign Policy towards the European Union' in Ludlam and Smith (eds.), op. cit., p.246.

British Conservatism, that there were "essentially political motives for the application" to join the EC, but that this was 'played down' by Macmillan who presented it "to the Conservative Party and to Parliament as a move made for essentially economic reasons."[8]

Britain's hopes for EEC entry were dashed when de Gaulle effectively blocked further discussions on the prospect of Britain's entry. The relationship between Britain and the US proved to de Gaulle that Britain was not committed to Europe and thus was not ready to become a member of the EEC. De Gaulle was "opposed to Anglo-American domination of the capitalist world... in favour of Europe following an independent line in world affairs."[9] Hence, he stated at a press conference, (without having consulted the member states) that he was to exercise his veto as "The British, he declared, were not yet ready to be true Europeans."[10]

The same year that Macmillan approached the EC, the Monday Club was established. Judging by a memo issued to Club members on 26th October 1962 specifically on Britain's application for entry into the Common Market, its initial stance was undecided. The Club stated at that stage it would not pass an opinion on the proposed entry until the

---

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid., p.245.

10. Brivati and Jones, op. cit., pp.17-18.

negotiations had been completed by the British Government: "Until we see the results of the negotiations in Brussels and ... take stock of the terms that have been agreed upon we can in no way say whether it is a good thing to be in Europe with the six or to work out our own alternative."[11]

Following Britain's unsuccessful application, the Club issued a second memo. It was suggested that Britain should avoid being too critical of de Gaulle and France, as it might result in Britain isolating itself from Europe. The Club also recommended that Britain should forge greater economic ties with other countries, and thus suggested a Commonwealth alternative to the Common Market, similar to EFTA.[12]

The first of these two memos is surprising as, according to Club member Robert Copping in The Story of the Monday Club, in the initial stages of the Club's development, it was formally against Britain becoming a member of the EEC. As was mentioned in the second memo, he also suggests the Club favoured a Commonwealth alternative in place of the EEC, which demonstrates the Monday Club's adherence to the Imperialist diehard stance discussed earlier. He states that this stance was soon abandoned thus leaving it

---

11. CCO 3/6/16, Monday Club memo re: the Common Market, 26th October 1962, p.3.

12. CCO 3/6/16, Monday Club memo re: failure of Common Market Negotiations, 1st February 1963, p.1.

with no official policy.[13] Although the Club had no formal line on Europe, he goes on, its Executive Council appealed to the members not to engage in establishing committees within the Club, either for or against the EEC. However, individuals were not prevented from publishing material on the subject in the Club's publications.[14]

Consequently, it would appear that Europe became a matter of individual Club members' convictions, which appeared to mirror events in the mainstream political arena. Despite the two main parties having formulated a policy on Europe the members of the parties did not feel that they had to 'tow the party line.' Hence, divisions were rife within both the Conservative and Labour Parties and the Monday Club was soon to become as divided over Europe as the main parties. The Labour Party at this stage was opposed to Britain's entry into the EEC. This was highlighted at the Labour Party conference in 1962, when Hugh Gaitskell declared that if Britain became a member of the EEC, it "would mean the end of Britain as an independent European State...the end of a thousand years of history."[15]

As the Club's lack of an official policy on Europe should remind us, it needs to be emphasised that literature produced by the Club does not necessarily reflect the Executive

---

13. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.19.

14. Ibid., pp.19-20.

15. Nevin, op. cit., p.15.

Council's position. However, from the material published by the Club, a pattern seems to emerge; from 1962 to 1980 the publications would appear to be more pro-European, whereas after 1980 the literature tended to be more antagonistic. This need not reflect opinion within the Club as such; instead, those in favour of Europe may merely have more frequently expressed their opinion in the earlier period, whilst the Eurosceptics were more vocal with the advent of the Thatcher administrations.

The division on Europe within the Club is perhaps most clearly demonstrated in a pamphlet, Should Britain Join? (published in 1966). This was in the format of an exchange of letters between Sir Anthony Meyer and Victor Montagu, the purpose of which was to highlight the pro and anti European arguments between two prominent Conservative MPs. Meyer took the pro-European stance and Montagu took the opposing view. The principle issue propounded by Meyer was the security aspect of the EEC, which he supported by examining World War II. Hence, he claimed he stood with the likes of Churchill in arguing that a closer European alliance would reduce the chance of war. The issue of defence was a primary concern for Meyer and he envisaged that the EEC would eventually establish a system whereby security would be the primary focus. A second benefit of EEC entry suggested by Meyer was of an economic nature, that membership would result in a wider market for British industry, thereby enabling industrial expansion, as well as promoting confidence and certainty within the UK economy.[16]

---

16. Should Britain Join?, London: Monday Club, 1966, p.19.

Montagu's reply centred around his belief that European unity would not eradicate war, as its causes were complex and there was "no proof at all that war and insurrection in themselves can be stopped by the merging of sovereignty and the setting up of political federations or confederations."[17] Consequently, he saw no purpose in Britain joining the EEC and he, like some other Club members, preferred a Commonwealth alternative.

This pamphlet not only served to highlight the arguments over Europe, but also to demonstrate how entrenched the pro and anti Europeans were, with little chance of any dramatic shift in attitude in either of the two camps. In addition, the focus on links with Commonwealth countries highlights the Monday Club's preoccupation with Empire and former colonies.

The 1960s proved to be a turbulent time for the successive administrations. Macmillan experienced economic difficulties and his attempt to gain accession to the EEC had been thwarted by de Gaulle. In 1967, Wilson attempted to re-open negotiations for Britain's entry into the EEC. In response, the Monday Club in a pamphlet, The Aims of the Monday Club, published in February 1967, expressed its Executive Council's general attitude. It was stated that "Britain's future lies in Europe, but as a base for, not an alternative to, wider responsibilities. The exact form of this participation in a united

---

17. Ibid., p.8.

Europe remains to be negotiated."[18] Hence, the Club's stance continued to be non-committal. However, the prospect for Britain's negotiations was thwarted once again by de Gaulle who, in December 1967, exercised his veto on the grounds that the UK's balance of payments was too weak. It seemed at this stage that while de Gaulle was President of France, Britain would not be able to enter the EEC.

Following on from Montagu's earlier publication for the Monday Club, a publication was produced following three "Third Programme" broadcasts, previously published in The Listener. This pamphlet, The Conservative Dilemma, focussed on the preservation of Commonwealth interests which Montagu believed were paramount to any other world alliances. Consequently, he again declared his opposition to Britain's entry into the Common Market, claiming that it would not only involve a loss of sovereignty but it would also jeopardise Commonwealth trade preference as well as forcing Britain to impose tariffs on goods imported from Commonwealth countries.[19]

Despite the setbacks experienced by successive Governments in attempting to enter the EEC, the Conservative Party pledged in its 1970 election manifesto that it would attempt to secure Britain's entry to the EEC. It stated: "If we can negotiate the right terms... we believe it would be in the long-term interest of the British people for Britain to join the

---

18. The Aims of the Monday Club, London: Monday Club, 1967, p.2.

19. Victor Montagu, The Conservative Dilemma, London: Monday Club, 1970, pp.3-9.

European Economic Community."[20] Within weeks of Edward Heath taking office, in June 1970 he had re-opened discussions with the EEC; fortunately for him, de Gaulle had resigned from office the previous year and thus the UK's entry looked feasible. The opening of Britain's negotiations with the EEC involved one of the most prominent members of the Monday Club, Geoffrey Rippon, QC. Whilst he was in Heath's cabinet he was known as 'Mr Europe', as he was the Chief negotiator for the terms and conditions for the UK's Treaty of Accession.[21] Hence, for Rippon the issue of EEC entry was of primary importance, and he was more than willing to express his feelings on Europe. For example, at the Monday Club annual dinner in 1970, when he was a guest of honour, Rippon declared: "Britain stands at a cross roads in her history. The choice between a vigorous future and decline into obscurity faces the British people more starkly than ever before."[22]

Enthusiastic support for joining the EC was continued by Rippon and he consequently received much publicity. The Times in April of 1971, for instance, included in a report on a Conservative Party seminar on energy, Rippon's defence of the Government's move

---

20. Brivati and Jones, op. cit., p.184.

21. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.19.

22. Ibid., p.19.

into Europe where he stated that the UK's living standards were far below that of her European counterparts. Therefore, he declared; "The time and issues are now ripe for decisions. We shall not get better terms by waiting around."[23] However, as we have seen, Rippon's pro-European stance was not necessarily that of the Club itself. Indeed, for some it was unacceptable. One leading member, Edward Taylor, resigned from his post as Under Secretary for Scotland over the issue of Europe. As for the Club as a whole, at its AGM in April 1971, a proposal for it to be formally against the signing of the Treaty of Rome was put forward by Gordon Middleton (former chairman of the Monday Club's education group). This was carried by those present at the AGM, but despite this vote the Club's Executive Council opted for no official policy.[24]

In July 1971, the Monday Club Chairman, George Pole, sent a letter to all members of the Executive Council stating that following discussions held at Executive Council meetings, it was "Decided unanimously that in the best interest of the Club we should not take a line either for or against entry. We agreed that to do so would prove divisive and would weaken our influence and effectiveness in many other aspects of policy." However, Pole then added that this "Does not of course exclude members actively

---

23. The Times, 28th April 1971, p.7.

24. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.20.

supporting one side or the other outside the Club."[25] Following this decision, at an Executive Council meeting in September 1971, the Council appealed for all members to get permission of the Club Chairman before giving out information to the press about their stance on Europe.[26] The following month the Club's Executive Council minutes reported that a pro-EEC group had sprung up within the Monday Club. Again it repeated its resolve "that members of the group be requested not to issue any information to the press without the prior permission of the Chairman."[27] However, divisions within the Club continued throughout the remaining months of 1971.

---

25. DPW/40/11, letter from Pole, 30th July 1971. The Club's decision to remain neutral on the issue of Britain's entry into the Common Market was not unnoticed outside its ranks. In the journal of the British Israel Movement, who believed that Britain was God's chosen nation, the Club's Executive was criticised for ignoring the anti-Marketeers' vote during the debate at its AGM in April 1971: "Fearful of tearing themselves asunder they saved the Club perhaps, but they forgot Britain." It declared that the decision of the Executive Council to remain neutral was "neither fair, nor just, nor patriotic." Lt.-Cdr. Michael Hart, R.N., "Britain and the Common Market"; The National Message, June 1972, p.180.

26. DPW/40/11, minutes of Executive Council meeting, 18th October 1971.

27. DPW/40/10, 27th September 1971.

In September, The Times printed an article concerning the pro-Common Market group that had emerged in the Monday Club involving Julian Amery, G.K. Young, John Biggs-Davison, Geoffrey Stewart-Smith, Horace Cutler, Sir Victor Raikes, and John Fairhead. It was claimed by these Club members that the formation of a group was not their intention; rather, they claimed that they were merely attempting to launch a counter attack against the Club's anti-European stance, particularly as the Club was holding a conference on the EEC the following month.[28] Despite the formation of the pro-EEC group, at the Club's Conference on October 2nd, a resolution opposing Britain's entry into the EEC was, once again, passed with 66 votes to 47.[29]

At the 1971 Conservative Party Conference, a ballot was held on whether the Party should favour Britain's entry to the EEC, with the result of the vote 2474 in favour of entry and only 324 against.[30] Consequently, Conservative Party policy was established as pro-European. However, entry into the EEC caused repeated problems for the Conservative Government, as it did not receive full support from the Parliamentary Party. Controversy continued, although opposition did not prevent the agreement for the Treaty of Accession going through swiftly.

---

28. The Times, 17th September 1971, p.12.

29. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.20.

30. F.W.S. Craig (ed.), British General Election Manifestos 1900-1974, p.342 cited by Norton, op. cit., p.53.

Britain's terms of entry were laid down in the White Paper, The UK and the European Communities, (Cmnd 4715), on 7th July 1971. Shortly after its publication, the anti-Europeans tabled an early day motion (EDM) urging the Government to accept entry terms which would guarantee the safeguard of British sovereignty and the ability for Britain to decide its own economic and social policy and to protect interests in the EFTA and Commonwealth. This was tantamount to asking the Government to reject the terms of entry. An EDM was also tabled for a free vote whether or not to accept Britain's entry on the terms negotiated. The Chief Whip granted a free vote. On 28th October 1971, the White Paper was carried by 356 to 244 votes.[31] The following year, a motion was tabled requesting the Government not to sign the Treaty of Accession until all the terms had been published. In response to this, the Government tabled an amendment, which stated that the full terms of entry would not be operational until they had been published. Some Conservatives still voted against the Government, but the amendment was carried. The EEC Bill was passed on its second reading in February 1972. Heath made the vote a vote of no confidence in order to assure its passage, but despite his attempts to get the whole of the Conservative Parliamentary Party backing the Government, 15 Conservative MPs still voted against the Government.[32] The Bill passed through the Committee stage, but opponents to the Bill called for amendments. On July 13th 1972, the third reading of the Bill was passed, with 16 Conservatives cross-voting and 14 abstaining.

---

31. Ibid., p.74.

32. Ibid., p.71.

In Philip Norton's study of Conservative Party dissent, he found a positive correlation between those MPs voting against the Government on the EC Bill and those voting against Rhodesian sanctions. He found a greater correlation between those opposed to EEC entry and those opposing the 1972 Immigration Bill.[33] Some of those Club members who at some stage voted against the Immigration Bill and Rhodesia sanctions and who also voted against the EC were Ronald Bell, Stephen Hastings, Anthony Fell, Victor Goodhew, Richard Stokes, Teddy Taylor and Patrick Wall.

On January 1st 1973, the UK (along with Denmark and Ireland) became a member of the EC. It has been suggested that for the British people "European integration was at best a necessity, not...an ideal."[34] Consequently, after Britain's accession to the EC the debate and hostility still remained, and while during the seventies the Club's reaction to Britain becoming a part of the EEC appears to have been favourable, it remained an issue of individual conviction. At the beginning of 1973, Monday News carried an article, "Choice in Europe: a sort of fanfare." It generally welcomed the UK's membership to the EC, emphasising that the Club was not anti-European per se, and that there were valid arguments in both the pro and anti European camps. The closing statement of the piece

---

33. Ibid., p.246.

34. John W. Young, Britain and the World in the Twentieth Century, New York: Arnold, 1997, p.66.

was that "The Monday Club welcomes the prospect of striving in partnership...for common ideals."[35] This notion was qualified by the observation that the Club favoured the fostering of enterprise and initiative in all spheres of British interest. However, the author claimed that the move towards Europe was the best thing Heath's Government had achieved while in office. Andrew Hunter MP recalled in a later interview that when he joined the Club in 1972 the majority of Club members believed Heath's rhetoric on Europe, that is to say, there would be economic benefits with no political dimension. However, Hunter believed this sentiment was short-lived.[36]

Following the 1974 General Election, the Labour Party was returned to Government. However, as Labour did not have an overall majority, later that same year a second election was held which gave Labour a very slim majority. Labour's election manifesto included a pledge to change the terms and conditions of Britain's Treaty of Accession to make them more favourable to Britain (Wilson had opposed the Treaty of Accession because of the terms of entry, and was therefore determined to renegotiate terms). As Labour failed to act on this once it was in power the left of the Party forced Wilson to hold a referendum in the belief that the public would vote against Britain's continued membership of the EC. Therefore in 1975, a referendum was held on whether the UK

---

35. Monday News, January 1973, p.3.

36. Interview with Andrew Hunter, 8th June 1998.

should remain part of the EC. The Monday Club in 1975 published a pamphlet, Referenda: PR; Whose decision? which dealt with the issue of the 1975 referendum, amongst other questions. According to the author, he opposed the referendum on the basis that it was a "...major threat to Britain's greatest constitutional invention, namely government by parliament."[37] There was no action taken by the Club's Executive Council as with the whole issue of Europe it would appear that it chose to ignore it.

The result of the referendum was a two to one vote in favour of remaining in the EC. However, Hugo Young argued in This Blessed Plot: Britain and Europe From Churchill to Blair, that "The referendum did not determine much."[38] It certainly did not silence the critics of Britain's continued membership. Indeed, it served to provoke more hostility within the political sphere, both in the anti and pro European camps.

In March 1976 Harold Wilson resigned from office due to ill health. James Callaghan took office and immediately faced a sterling crisis and was consequently forced to take a loan from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and to reduce welfare expenditure. The issue of Europe proved to be as problematic for Callaghan as it had been for Wilson. The initial problem was the direct European Parliamentary elections that were held in 1978,

---

37. Brian Costello, Referenda; PR – Whose Decision?, London: Monday Club, 1975, p.5.

38. Hugo Young, This Blessed Plot: Britain and Europe From Churchill to Blair, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1998, p.299.

and the British Parliament failing to pass the relevant legislation in order for these to take place. Britain had also refused to join the European Monetary system (EMS), established in 1978. In addition, the level of Britain's budgetary contributions were not accepted by Callaghan's Foreign Secretary, David Owen, as they were the highest of all member states (a subject which remained an issue of debate throughout the Thatcher administrations).[39]

Despite the reluctance shown towards Europe within the main political parties, the Monday Club's publications still showed a degree of support towards the European Union. Hence, in February 1977 the Club produced a pamphlet, Why Europe needs Spain. Its purpose was to put forward an argument in favour of Spain's proposed membership of the EC when the other member states were somewhat hostile. A main objection to Spain's entry was its lack of democracy. Although there were no definite rules regarding a country's entry into the EC, in July 1975, whilst discussing Portugal's entry, the EC Heads of Government had stated "the European Community can give support only to a democracy of a pluralist nature."[41] The Club's pamphlet, however, claimed that Heath and the Conservative Party, as well as the Club, were all sympathetic towards Spain as they hoped to encourage it to move towards a true democracy and aid economic expansion, which could be achieved due to Spain's large population,

---

39. Brivati and Jones, op. cit., p.182.

40. Why Europe Needs Spain, London: Monday Club, 1977, p.2.

expanding industrial sector and its geographical position. For the Club, the only drawback with Spain's membership was the existence of the Spanish Communist Party (PCE). With this in mind, the Club suggested that the Conservative Party and the Club would continue to support Spain's entry as long as Spain has a favourable government, that is to say, not Communist.[41]

Following the turbulent time experienced by the Club in the early 1970s, a publication by Club member Robert Copping, which appeared in the mid-1970s titled The Monday Club - Crisis and After, focussed on the Club's stance on a variety of issues. With regard to its view on Europe, it called for Britain to protect her sovereignty, as well as wanting "...the curbing of bureaucracy in Brussels."[42] This pamphlet highlighted a more aggressive stance taken by the Monday Club compared to previous publications. This position was not typical of Club publications at this time, as the Club's concern over any loss of sovereignty was not apparent until the 1980s. Instead, the majority of the Club's literature during the seventies carried a positive view of Europe as highlighted in a paper produced in the late 1970s. The paper, An Un-guarded Legacy: a Conservative Approach to European Unity, included extracts from Mrs Thatcher's speeches, who, as the quote below suggests was at the time, an ardent supporter of the EC: "We are the European

---

41. Ibid., pp.5-6.

42. Copping, 1975, op. cit., p.13.

Party in the Britain Parliament and among the British people and we want to co-operate whole heartedly with our partners in this joint venture."[43]

The pro-European stance taken in the pamphlet was established early on, not only with the use of extracts from Mrs Thatcher's speeches, but with such claims as "...Europe is where we are and where we have always been. This is no geographic quibble. We are spiritually 'part of the main.'"[44] However, in spite of the pamphlet's support for Europe, the usual argument put forward in the Club's literature were repeated; that the Club preferred the EC to function through co-operation rather than bureaucracy or supranationalism. This was essentially because the Club wanted to safeguard traditional British institutions, such as the monarchy.

A new aspect of this pamphlet, was the place of Conservatism in the EC, arguing that there was need for more co-operation with co-thinkers elsewhere: "The broad impression of the European Right is of fragmentation."[45] One of the main reasons for the Club's wish

---

43. Europe...The Unguarded Legacy: A Conservative Approach to European Unity, London: Monday Club, 1977, p.1.

44. Ibid., p.3.

45. Ibid., p.8.

for unity amongst the European Right was to act as a counter-force against what it perceived to be a more unified left. The reason for the lack of co-operation within conservatism, it was suggested, somewhat surprisingly, was nationalism; "One of the most common features of Right Wing ideologies is nationalism...nationalism tends to exclude unity." Another factor that prevented an alliance amongst the Right, it claimed, was the differing foundations of these parties which tended to be either religious, or based on laissez faire principles.[46]

John Biggs-Davison continued the notion of Europe as a counter-force in an article in Tory Challenge, in March 1978, where he outlined Club policies for the 1979 General Election. Europe, he argued, was a counter-force against the Soviet Bloc and a force to provide protection, particularly as the USA's protection had decreased and the Soviet Union's influence had increased. He also envisaged the 'joining' of Europe with Commonwealth countries in a type of contractual relationship forming an "effective partnership of sovereign nations with not only a common market but common diplomacy and defence."[47]

While some Club members were expressing support for Europe, the rest of the political arena was as divided as ever. When the Conservatives were in opposition, Mrs Thatcher

---

46. Ibid., p.6.

47. Tory Challenge, March 1978, p.5.

stated that Conservative Party was "the Party of Europe."[48] However, the change in her approach to Europe when she gained power in 1979, was said to have been shaped by the deep-seated convictions of certain right wing MPs who were against the EC and had supported her leadership. It was said that during Mrs Thatcher's first term in Office she "discovered that to be a sceptic about the benefits of belonging to the EC put her in a stronger position than her opponents".[49] This also, it was suggested, helped to marginalise the pro-Europeans within the Conservative Party.

With regard to Europe, Thatcher was immediately faced with the issue that had troubled the Callaghan Government, namely the level of Britain's monetary contributions to the EC budget. However, EC members regarded her interventions as being carried out in a confrontational and nationalistic manner, and did not take kindly to how the rebates were called for. Although the UK's relationship with the EC was in a sense acrimonious, the EC did grant the budgetary rebates at the Fountainbleau European Council meeting in 1984.

The hostility demonstrated by the Thatcher administrations towards the EC found favour with the anti-Europeans in the Monday Club and it was noticeable that they became more

---

48. Ludlam and Smith, op. cit., p.246.

49. Ibid., p.248.

vocal with the advent of the new Prime Minister. As noted above, in previous publications the Club did not appear nationalistic towards Europe; however, this was set to change with the main critics of the EC in the Club, Edward Taylor and K.Harvey Proctor, vocalising their fears over Britain's continued membership. In considering this shift, and with the likes of Proctor in a strong position within the Club, some pro-Europeans had left the Club, such as Rippon. In an article in Monday World, "Britain or the EEC – Nation or Federal State?" (published in early 1982), Proctor and Taylor focussed on the loss of sovereignty, which Proctor claimed was "not an abstract notion, it is the practical fact of life when negotiating with the EC." For Proctor, the UK's membership of the EC was only serving to act against the country's interests. Thus he suggested, in order to protect the nation, Britain should withdraw from the EC immediately. Although he recognised that this move would be illegal, he stated that the country had no choice if it valued its sovereignty.[50]

A few months later, the Club's Executive Council published a pamphlet, The Conservative Party and the Common Market, written by David Storey and Teddy Taylor, MP. It was essentially anti-European, which was not surprising, given Taylor's opposition to Britain's accession to the EC right from the start. The declared purpose of the pamphlet was to encourage discussion within the Conservative Party on the issue of the EC. It received approval from the Club's Executive Council. One important aspect

---

50. Monday World, April 1982, p.4.

raised in the pamphlet was the claim that the Conservatives were on the wrong side of the argument, as the EC was protectionist and a high spending organisation, whereas the Tories favoured reduced public spending. In addition, it was argued that the UK's membership of the EC would result in a higher cost of living, high unemployment and 'food mountains,' as well as destroying the so-called special relationship with the USA.[51]

The authors of the pamphlet put forward suggestions to eradicate the problems they perceived the UK was facing. There were two favoured alternatives. The first was associate membership, which had always been preferred by President de Gaulle for the UK. He had proposed a two tier EC, with free trade members (associate members) and full members (federalists).[52] The second option listed in the pamphlet was major reform in the EC, which could give Britain all the benefits of EC membership, such as free trade, but none of the disadvantages, such as the loss of sovereignty.[53] It was claimed in the pamphlet that these plans would not only find favour with the Conservative Party, but also the electorate.

---

51. David Storey and Edward Taylor, The Conservative Party and the Common Market, London: Monday Club, 1982, p.3.

52. Ibid., pp.14-16.

53. Ibid.

In 1985, the European Union Draft Treaty (known as the Single European Act - SEA) was passed, which proposed to create a free internal market in 1992, thereby removing the remaining trade barriers in all goods and services. Initially the Thatcher Administration regarded the Act as being solely about free markets and welcomed the economic aspect of the Treaty. However, there was also a social dimension to the Treaty, the Social Chapter, and a proposal for monetary union, which were not favoured by Thatcher, or by those who were not necessarily anti-European per se, but were opposed to moves towards a federalist Europe. Hence, when these other dimensions came under discussion, Mrs Thatcher was openly opposed to them.

Prior to 1985, Euro-scepticism within the Conservative Government did not prove problematic, particularly with Thatcher's success with budgetary rebates. However, the SEA led to minor dissent. In April 1986, the European Communities (Amendment) Bill, saw the likes of Teddy Taylor, a Monday Club member, voting against the Government. Despite objections, it was passed 270 votes to 153.[54] The main 'bone of contention' was the loss of Britain's veto due to the adoption of a qualified majority voting (QMV). This led to concerns over Britain's sovereignty.[55] The Treaty was signed in February 1986, ratified later that year and came into effect on 1st January 1987.

---

54. Young, op. cit., p.334.

55. Ludlam and Smith, op. cit., p.109.

In September 1988, regarding the SEA, Mrs Thatcher spoke at the College of Europe in Bruges, where she launched a celebrated attack on what she saw as the development of a federal Europe: "We have not successfully rolled back the frontiers of the state only to see them reimposed at the European level."[56] Mrs Thatcher's hostility was shared amongst the Conservative Party and some members of the Monday Club. However, a Club discussion paper on the European Draft Treaty was unaligned. It questioned whether the Treaty was a "Bold political initiative or insidious attempt to shift the balance of power in Europe irreversibly? As ever, it depends on the assumptions made, the objectives, and the position from which one views the process." Having took the stance of explaining the issue of the Draft Treaty and the views from both sides of the argument on the prospect of further European integration, the paper argued that the EC's structure did not warrant change and rather it preferred to see the EC remain as it was, fulfilling its original role.[57]

With the prospect of European integration looming increasingly closer, the 1989 Conservative Party Conference issue of the Club's publication, Right Ahead, contained an article by Teddy Taylor, "The EEC: the other side of the coin". He claimed, that the Conservative Government had been influenced by the Monday Club, as the Government

---

56. Ibid., p.110.

57. Eric Forth, The Draft Treaty of European Union, London: Monday Club, 1988, p.4.

was now seen to be opposing developments within the EC. Taylor's claim appears surprising due to the Club's lack of an official policy on Europe. But with reference to this change in attitude, he welcomed it and he called for a firmer stance to be formally adopted by the Conservatives, as "The future of our democracy, our economy and of Thatcher policies require a change of policy now."[58]

With the likelihood of further European integration, Europe proved to be even more of a contentious issue for the Conservative Party. Steve Ludlam claims in Contemporary British Conservatism, that was primarily because, "...it threatens the sovereign status of the nation and the state whose defence has been crucial to the Tories' extraordinary appeal since the mid nineteenth century as the party of the Union, the constitution and the Empire."[59]

It might be thought, given the intensity of its nationalism, that the Club would see the issue in the same light. Yet, as we have seen, its position is difficult to define. The Club as an organisation has not had a policy on the EC and it contained not only opponents of the EC but enthusiasts for it. One can find areas of agreement between the two camps. Both sought to maintain sovereignty, were opposed to federalism and to Communism. But they did not agree on what a patriotic approach should be.

---

58. Right Ahead, Conference Issue 1989, p.2.

59. Ludlam and Smith, op. cit., p.100.

Chapter Eight: Conclusion

The object of this concluding chapter is to analyse how the Monday Club should be understood and to evaluate the ways in which and the extent to which it has contributed to the Conservative Party, the Conservative Governments and the modern British Right.

One of the key questions is what kind of right wing movement was it? As we have seen, the impetus for the establishment of the Club was Macmillan's so-called 'winds of change' speech. However, attempting to reverse the policy of decolonisation was not the only aim of the Club. It was also responding to what it perceived as the leftward drift of the Conservative Party under Macmillan's leadership. Hence, the Club itself saw its purpose as "safeguarding and propagating...traditional Tory principles."[1] Despite this statement by the Club, its Conservatism is not easily classified. One potentially useful approach is to compare it with the much discussed question of Enoch Powell's challenge to the post war settlement. Indeed, as Philip Lynch suggests instead of "a nostalgic longing for past imperial glories" he sought to construct a "post-imperial" nationalism. Powell was close to the Club but for both ideological and individual reasons, he operated outside its confines. Unfortunately, Lynch says almost nothing about the Club[2] even

---

1. Copping, 1975, op. cit., p.12.

2. Philip Lynch, The Politics of Nationhood: Sovereignty, Britishness and Conservative Politics, Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1999, p.24.

though his focus on nationhood would seem very appropriate to it. Like Powell, who Lynch does discuss extensively[3], the Club was also engaged in "a quest for renewed national identity and a strong nation-state".[4] But as with Powell, its central concerns stretched more widely. It was focused not only on race, Europe and Ulster, three of Lynch's main areas of discussion, but also on what it saw as Britain's economic collectivism. We can draw from Lynch's discussion both for his overall focus on nationhood and his treatment of specific themes. Nonetheless, his discussion is not intended to capture the Monday Club's overall agenda. A more productive approach would be to draw on Andrew Gamble's discussion of the New Right.

As has been discussed, the Club was pulled towards the New Right on economics, which included its approach to education, health and welfare provision. If we take the definition of the New Right used by Gamble, as discussed in chapter one, the New Right "is identified with opposition to state involvement in the economy" as well as advocating "national discipline and strong defence."[5] Although Gamble admits that the New Right "does not signify... a unified movement or coherent doctrine", it does, he claims, contain

---

3. Ibid., pp.38-45.

4. Ibid., p.38.

5. Gamble, 1988, op. cit., p.28.

a common element which is the "rejection" of post war consensus.[6] Within the New Right, Gamble declares, are two strands, the neo-liberal and libertarian strand such as the IEA, Adam Smith Institute, Freedom Association and Centre for Policy Studies (CPS) and the conservative strand which includes the likes of the Monday Club.[7]

As the study has shown, in line with economic liberalism the Club was in favour of the free movement of capital. However, the Club's economic policy demonstrates a tautology as while it argued for the free market, with regard to race and immigration it was openly against immigration. Indeed, Seyd has argued that the Club's policy framework was incoherent more broadly:

"certain inconsistencies exist in the Monday Club's liberalism. Whilst demanding that individualism should be encouraged in economic and social policy it demands that the state's power should be increased in such fields as industrial relations, in terms of more restrictive legislation to curb trade union activity or civil liberties, in terms of calling for Government curbing of student demonstrations and the powers of the police and armed forces, particularly against Irish paramilitary nationalism. It is in favour of increasing the power of the policeman, the employer and the vice-chancellor and of diminishing the power of the demonstrator, the trade unionist and the student. Whilst expressing the class

---

6. Ibid., p.27.

7. Gamble, 1988, op. cit., p.147.

interest of its supporters with perfect clarity it fails to achieve the philosophical consistency of classical liberalism."[8]

In Gamble's argument, it would be perfectly possible to have such a conflict, yet still be describable as New Right. But is the term New Right completely helpful when defining the Monday Club's ideology? Certainly, it may not fully capture the Club's ideology, whose focus on race and immigration policy differed sharply from the IEA or the CPS. (When another New Right group, The National Association For Freedom, was established in 1975, according to the anti-racist publication Searchlight it was conscious of the problems the Club had experienced as a result of its race and immigration policy and it "took great care" to exclude them "from its literature"[9]).

While we might hesitate to apply the term New Right without, at least, some caveats, that does not mean we should define the Club as extreme right. Due to its race and immigration policy it did receive the attention from the NF. It is easy to see the links between the Club and the extreme right and we have noted Martin Webster's admission

---

8. Seyd, op. cit., p.480.

9. Searchlight, October 1984, p.14.

that the Club was seen as a vehicle for infiltration. The Club's concern regarding the alleged links with the NF were highlighted in a letter that was sent from Paul Williams to Patrick Wall, which stated, "The National Front are no friends of ours but will make a considerable appeal to our younger and more militant members. I think we will have to watch this rather carefully."[10] It is certain that the NF was compatible with major aspects of the Club's policy framework, namely on race and immigration (although not, of course, with regard to voluntary repatriation), Empire and anti-Communism. However, it was not compatible on economics and Europe as the NF opposed economic liberalism and was anti-European. (The NF described the Club as being "confused on Europe" as a result of the Club's Executive failing to take a stance on the issue[11]). In addition, as we have seen in chapter two, some members within the Club were interested in continental authoritarian thinkers, such as Maurras and Salazar. However, despite the connection between the Club and the extreme right, the Club cannot be classified as part of this movement. Roger Griffin, the key writer on fascism, defined the "ideal type of generic fascism" which a number of writers have also used. For example, David Baker applied it

---

10. DPW/40/8, letter from Paul Williams, 5th May 1969.

11. Durham, op. cit., pp.90-1.

to his study of A.K Chesterton, a fascist of the 1930s who became the first leader of the NF.[12] Griffin's definition was based on "The mythic core...the vision of the (perceived) crisis of nation as betokening the birth-pangs of a new 'order."[13] This core is comprised of three parts, "'populist ultra-nationalism', the palingenetic myth of rebirth', and 'the myth of decadence'".[14] The Monday Club while it resembles fascism with its ultra nationalism (although due to its uncertain stance on Europe its commitment to nationalism is ambiguous), did not hold with the view that the nation needed 'a new order'. Unlike the NF, the Club believed that the current political system could be reformed through a 'truly conservative' Conservative Party, free market economics and immigration controls. In Mudde's definition, it is possible to be part of the extreme right without showing the characteristics Griffin describes as fascist. A more productive way forward, however, as we have suggested earlier, is to exclude the Club from the extreme right and to define it as part of a less discussed radical right.

As both the Club's view on Europe and, in its formative years, corporatism, demonstrates, what the Club was politically is not easy to define. Until 1964 it was concerned predominantly with the maintenance of the Empire and during these formative

---

12. David Baker, Ideology of Obsession: A.K.Chesterton and British Fascism, London: Tauris Academic Studies, 1996, p.5, p.10, pp.12-13, p.211.

13. Roger Griffin (ed.) Fascism, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, p.4.

14. Baker, op. cit., p.12.

years the membership tended to be traditional paternalist and imperialist conservatives. This fits with Gamble's Imperialist diehard term as discussed in chapter one. Likewise, David Edgar has argued that the Monday Club "...proselytized the more ancient and venerable conservative traditions of paternalism, imperialism and racism."[15] However, by the late 1960s and early 1970s the Club propounded a policy of economic liberalism and opposition to immigration. This is highlighted by Stephen Dorril and Robin Ramsay in Smear! Wilson and the Secret State. When trying to define the Club they declared that it contained "the old imperialist right, the traditional conservatives and the economic liberal right" and "there was might best be called the nationalist strand which overlapped both other tendencies."[16] Thus, although the term Imperialist diehard is useful to describe the Club's approach to Empire, it does not fully encapsulate the Club's stance on other issues such as economics. Here, Dunleavy's Combative Tory category might also be brought into play and his notion of the traditional far right.

The Club's Conservatism can be seen as aligned to the economic liberals of the New Right on economics. It has some overlap with the extreme Right. However, it is not fascist as it believes that the current political system is still viable and it does not believe that the decay is so severe that revolution is needed to save the nation. The most useful

---

15. David Edgar, "The Free and the Good" in Ruth Levitas (ed.), The Ideology of the New Right, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1986, p.60.

16. Dorril and Ramsay, op. cit., p.225.

term to describe the Monday Club, it could be suggested, is radical right. As discussed in chapter one, the term radical right as defined by Mudde and Eatwell, describes a movement that is anti-Communist, anti-alien, has a strong sense of nationalism and is prepared to operate within a democratic constitution. The Club fits this definition, but more intriguingly, the Club itself has applied the term radical right to its own right wing thought. The Club's journal, Monday World has carried the sub-title, "the magazine of the radical right"[17] and in Robert Copping's The Story of the Monday Club, he states that "The Monday Club represents what is sometimes referred to as the Radical Right in the Conservative Party."[18]

If that is how we might describe its politics, what effect did it have upon the Conservative Party? Its call for the Party to adopt radical right wing policies was not always welcomed by the Party leadership. Edward Heath, according to Rupert Morris, ignored the Monday Club.[19] From other sources it was apparent that he had little regard for it. For example, as

---

17. Monday World, London: The Monday Club, Winter 1969.

18. Copping, op. cit, 1975, p.28.

19. Rupert Morris, Tories: From Village Hall to Westminster a Political Sketch, Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing Company, 1991, pp.105-6.

discussed in chapter two, following the leadership battle in the early 70s the Club's Executive considered closing the Club. In a report on the Special General Meeting calling for Guinness's resignation (held on September 24th 1973) and discussing what the Club should do in the wake of this rebellion, the question was posed whether the Club was "really necessary". It was declared that the "Conservative Central Office thinks not" and it was suggested that the likes of Heath also thought that the Club was not necessary.[20]

Unlike Heath, Mrs. Thatcher was more sympathetic to the Club's views. As discussed in chapter two, in a letter from Thatcher to the Monday Club Chairman Sir Victor Raikes, she declared that "The Monday Club has always played a most useful role in defending traditional Conservative values and I hope that it will continue to do so."[21] Amy Elizabeth Ansell in New Right, New Racism: Race and Reaction in the US and Britain, declares

---

20. DPW/40/13, "Notes on the Special General Meeting of the Monday Club", 24th September 1973, p.1 of Part II and "What Now?" 31ST October 1973.

21. Letter to the Club from Mrs. Thatcher, 3rd May 1976, The Party Leadership and The Monday Club, London: The Monday Club, 1976, p.2.

that the Monday Club regarded Thatcher's election as heralding a new era for the Club.[22] Ansell has also suggested, using Mrs Thatcher's letter to the Club as evidence, that "The Thatcher administration restored and nurtured better relations with the Monday Club".[23] However, she declared that by the end of the 1980s and hence the Thatcher Governments, the Monday Club was "very much on the periphery", citing the fact that the Club was left out of the fringe meeting programme at the 1989 Conservative Party Conference.[24] In contrast, the study has shown that the Club had been in a more marginal position since the mid 1970s. Therefore, it would argue that it was even more 'on the periphery' by the late 1980s with it receiving very little media attention and the attention it did receive focussed on the Club harbouring extremists.[25]

With regard to the members the Club attracted, it would appear that it brought people into the Conservative Party whom otherwise may not have joined.[26] This has been seen by

---

22. Ansell, op. cit., p.147.

23. Ibid.

24. Ibid.

25. See: Searchlight, March 1989, pp.10-11, June 1989, pp.12-13, September 1990, pp.10-11.

26. CPA CCO 20/43/4, speech made to Monday Club, 20th November 1968.

former Monday Club members, Andrew Hunter and Gerald Howarth, when interviewed some years later, as a function of the Club and even one of its significant roles.[27] Likewise, the Club, through policy statements, declared that "The Monday Club feels that it can do the Conservative Party a great service by winning back many voters."[28]

This being the general opinion of Andrew Hunter, Gerald Howarth and Graham Webster-Gardiner, they also suggested that the Club was responsible for keeping people within the Party who may otherwise have left and may have joined the less respectable right.[29] Webster-Gardiner claimed that the Club kept the NF in a smaller position than it might have been. In addition, he declared that it enabled K.Harvey Proctor, Gerald Howarth and Neil Hamilton to become MPs. This was a consideration that the Club was a launching pad for younger members to establish their political career, particularly as there was a lot of cross-membership with other right wing organisations and there was much networking.[30]

---

27. Interviews with Andrew Hunter, 8th June 1998 and Gerald Howarth, 29th April 1998.

28. The Aims of the Monday Club, London: Monday Club, 1972, p.1.

29. Interviews with Andrew Hunter, 8th June1998, Gerald Howarth, 29th April 1998, and Graham Webster-Gardiner, 28th April 1998.

30. Interview with Graham Webster-Gardiner, 28th April 1998.

In terms of influence, a scientific cause and effect hypothesis cannot be adopted. For example, it cannot be assumed that if the Club proposed policies in the 1960s that were later implemented by Mrs Thatcher in the 1980s, that was a direct result of influence held by the Monday Club. In order to assess the Club's influence, a definition is needed. Steven Lukes in Power: A Radical View cites Robert Dahl's definition of influence whereby Dahl declares that "a rough test of a person's overt or covert influence is the frequency with which he successfully initiates an important policy over the opposition of others, or vetoes policies initiated by others, or initiates a policy where no opposition appears (sic)".[31] As Lukes' discussion makes clear, such a definition obscures important aspects of power. However, much of this discussion concerns class and how capitalism is reproduced, something which the Club was far too weak to significantly contribute to. It functioned as a faction within a party and, as such, Dahl's approach remains a useful 'rough test' and this study will evaluate the Club's influence in terms of whether there is evidence to suggest that a policy espoused by the Club was adopted by the Conservative Party or the Conservative Government, or whether through Club actions it was able to block or 'veto' Conservative Government or Party policy. Here we need to bear in mind a crucial complication, that the Club often was not the only force in the Conservative Party or on the British Right pursuing, for instance, a policy of privatisation or of trade union restrictions.

---

31. Robert Dahl, Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1961, cited in Steven Lukes, Power: A Radical View, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1974, pp.13-14.

It is clear that the Club attempted to influence the Conservative Party in a number of ways including: Conference resolutions; recruiting MPs; establishing a larger membership and local and University branches; holding rallies; establishing study groups producing policies and literature. The Monday Club had always used the Party structure to attempt to promote its views within the Conservative Party leadership. For example, the Club had sought to introduce resolutions at Party Conference by mobilising support in the ballot to choose resolutions for debate. In 1965, as discussed in chapter three, Patrick Wall and the Marquis of Salisbury presented a draft resolution on the Government's Rhodesian Sanctions Order. The motion was amended after the Chairman of the Conference Steering Committee ruled it out of order. Despite the amendment the motion was still defeated.[32] Likewise, at the 1970 Conference, George Pole, the Club's Chairman, forwarded a motion for the withdrawal of the Rhodesian Sanctions. Again the motion was rejected.[33] In 1983 the Club succeeded in forwarding a motion calling for a voluntary repatriation programme. The motion was forwarded by K.Harvey Proctor and was again rejected.[34] Hence, the Club had limited success in getting issues on the Conference agenda but more significantly their rejection clearly demonstrates failed attempts at influence.

---

32. Stuart, op. cit., p.55.

33. Monday Club Newsletter, Monday Club, January/February, 1971, p.9 and pp.15-16.

34. Layton Henry, 1992, op. cit., pp.200-1.

The Club had also attempted to influence parliamentary selection at local branch level. Notably, as discussed in the second chapter, the Club was involved in attempting to oust the official Conservative Candidate, Nigel Fisher, in the Constituency of Surbiton. However, Jonathan Guinness, as Chairman of the Monday Club, issued a memo to all members requesting that members not oppose Conservative Party candidates. In addition, as we have seen, in 1987 the Club actively campaigned to keep K.Harvey Proctor as MP for Billericay when he was faced with a vote of no confidence from his constituency association.[35]

The Club, as noted in the second chapter, produced many publications in the form of magazines, newsletters, pamphlets and policy papers. Within its formative years the CPC was keen to publish a Monday Club pamphlet in order to bring it into the Party structure.[36] With the CPC wanting to involve the Club within its workings, it suggests that the Club had had some impact on the Conservative Party at that time, despite its relatively small size. Strike out or Strike Bound was the first Club pamphlet to be published by the CPC; it received media attention and in fact, took publicity away from a report produced by the Conservative Party's Committee on Industrial Relations.

---

35. Searchlight, May 1987, p.10.

36. Ramsden, op. cit., p.215.

According to John Ramsden in The Making of Conservative Party Policy, the Monday Club's pamphlet was deliberately given priority and therefore more publicity by the Director of the CPC, Peter Goldman. This was done because he wanted to publish Club literature "in order to draw this new body into the Party orbit – to attach it to the tentacle of the octopus."[37] The 'octopus' was a term used by the Conservative Research Department (CRD) to describe how it widened its contacts and "spread its tentacles into the Parliamentary Party, the CPC, the Bow Group, the University Conservatives, Swinton College and such unofficial bodies at the Inns of Court Conservative Association."[38] Nevertheless, the Club's publications were not always welcomed by the CRD; for example, the Monday Club's Ulster group produced a pamphlet, Ulster in Your Hands. It called for fair representation for Northern Ireland in Westminster. It was sent to the Conservative Party Chairman, Lord Carrington, and was not received well by the Conservative Research Department.[39]

As well as the Club producing many publications, the Club attempted to exert influence on the Conservative Party via the Club MPs. For example, Monday Club members were amongst a group of Conservative MPs who voted against the Conservative Party line on

---

37. Ibid.

38. Ibid., p.210.

39. CCO 20/43/6, Ulster in Your Hands, London: Monday Club, 1972.

the Rhodesian Sanctions Order in 1970, 1972 and 1973. Similarly, for those MPs joining the Club, it was clearly regarded as an important rallying point on the right. Amongst its MP members were Shadow Ministers and Ministers. As we have seen, these included, Paul Williams, Julian Amery, John Peyton, Geoffrey Rippon, Teddy Taylor and John Biggs-Davison.

With a number of MPs having been members of the Club, it is important to note the reasons some of them gave for joining the Club. John Bercow MP joined in 1981. He cites the Club's immigration policy as the reason why he joined. As secretary of the Club's Immigration and Repatriation Committee, he supported Powell in the belief that "large-scale immigration" was to be feared. However, he later resigned because of "unpleasant racists" within the Immigration Committee.[40]

Former Club member Gerald Howarth, when interviewed, gave Rhodesia as the reason for joining the Club in 1966 when he was studying at Southampton University (a University Club branch was established in 1966 following a speech made by Harold Soref to the November Club that had been formed at the University in response to UDI).[41]

---

40. Anne McElvoy, "Tory Boy", New Statesman, 13th November 2000, p.19. John Bercow was approached for an interview, however, an interview was not granted.

41. Interview with Gerald Howarth, 29th April 1998.

Andrew Hunter MP claimed the Club's stance on Rhodesia was the initial reason for him joining the Club in the mid 1960s and he declares that the support the Club gave Rhodesia is the "single greatest reason why I remain loyal to the Monday Club".[42] During the period examined for the study, Andrew Hunter has been a member of the Club on three occasions. He resigned the first time as he was a student and could not afford the subscription and the second time he resigned (in 1984) due to what he regarded as a racialist article. He then rejoined in 1990 and has been deputy chairman, which he said was a nominal role in which he is not that active. His reason for rejoining the Club in 1990, he declared, was to encourage it to remain active.[43]

Teddy Taylor, former Club member, was sympathetic to most of the Club's views, but declared in a letter that "while I still supported the aims of the Monday Club... I resigned quietly from the Club simply because I was a bit worried about some individuals who appeared to be involved in its management. It was not that they were extremist, I just thought they were a bit unusual."[44]

---

42. Interview with Andrew Hunter, 8th June 1998.

43. Ibid.

44. Letter from Teddy Taylor, 9th March 1998.

The above members appeared to have joined the Club because it held their view on an issue they were committed to. Hence, it would seem that those members interviewed joined because they felt the Club could continue to promote within the Party the issue they felt strongly about. So does this suggest that the Club were seen to hold influence within the Conservative Party? It is certain that influence was sought. For example, in September 1963, J.J.Francis, Chairman of the Club's study groups, stated in a letter to members that the aim of the study groups was "to provide the research on which the Conservative Party can advance within the limits of Toryism."[45] Years later John Biggs-Davison, when addressing a Club conference in October 1971, declared that the Club had become "one of the great forces in British politics".[46] The Club now regarded itself in a position to exert pressure on the Conservative Party. One member was quoted as saying: "We are now able to bring pressure to bear in a number of constituencies where members' ideas conflict with those of true conservatism. Within 10 years we, the Party's tail shall wag the dog."[47] Yet in the Club Chairman's report, some years later, David Storey stated that, "The need to think was overwhelming. The Club had lingered, for too long, in the role of a small, well intentioned organisation, trying desperately hard to influence events."[48]

---

45. DPW/40/1, letter to members, September 1963.

46. Speech by John Biggs-Davison at the Conservative Party Conference 2nd October 1971, Seyd, op. cit., p.472.

47. Daily Mirror, London, 15th March 1971, Michaels, op. cit., p.15.

48. DPW/40/26, Club Chairman's report, 1982.

From private correspondence between members it is obvious that there was a feeling within the Club that it had not been able to exert the influence on the Conservative Party that it had sought. In a letter from David Storey to Patrick Wall in 1979, Storey commented that:

"However strong the Club becomes it cannot compel the Party to do anything. Even the National Union that represents the Party completely fails to do that whenever it tries. The power is in the hands of the PM and secondly in the cabinet. The only way the Club can really influence the cabinet is through its members in the House of Commons and there we have not succeeded as we should."[49]

With regard to its economic policy the suggestions made in both Self Help Reborn and "Money - Your or Theirs? are the similar to reforms introduced by Thatcher Governments. Likewise, a Club pamphlet in 1969 specifically called for the privatisation of the coal and electricity industries and the Post Office.[50] However, it can not be shown that this had an influence on the Thatcher Administration when indeed it did privatise the coal and electricity industries. The Club was not the only group within the Conservative

---

49. DPW/40/33, letter to Patrick Wall from David Storey, 22nd October 1979.

50. DPW/40/8, "Forum of Denationalisation - Draft Proposals for Discussion", 27th January 1969.

Party at that time espousing economic liberalism. As previously stated the shift away from economic consensus politics of planning and Keynesianism by the Conservative Party in the mid 1960s was the result of election defeat. Think tanks such as the Institute for Economic Affairs had little influence at this point, although by the 1980s, along with the CPS and the Adam Smith Institute, this had changed. Not only did these groups and individuals have an impact on Conservative Party policy, it would also appear that they influenced the Club itself. For example, in the Club's pamphlet Economic Policy for the 1970s, which contained speeches from Rt. Hon. J. Enoch Powell MBE, MP, Dr Wyndam Davies and Peter Rost, the latter two both being members of the Monday Club, Davies used a study carried out by the IEA Towards a Welfare Society (London 1967), in his speech in support of his argument. This suggests that the Monday Club and its members looked to other groups as a source for its ideas on economics.[51] Similarly, Minford was not a Club economist initially but was influential and then recruited by the Club.

With reference to Africa, the Club itself admitted it had failed to exert any pressure on the Conservative Party and Conservative Governments with regard to safeguarding the future of white rule in the former state of Rhodesia. Although it could not be credited with exerting any influence on successive Governments on the issue of Rhodesia, it was

---

51. Economic Policy for the 1970s, London: Monday Club, 1968, p.16.

successful in gaining publicity, particularly with its "Stop Sanctions! Talk Now" Campaign. It also succeeded in getting a debate on sanctions at the 1970 Conservative Party Conference. Although this was defeated, Mark Stuart declares that there was some success from this debate as the then Foreign Secretary, Lord Home, announced the lifting of "two minor sanctions" at the Conference.[52] Furthermore, in the 1970s, prominent Conservative MPs, who were also Club members, such as Julian Amery and Ronald Bell, continued to dissent against the Government on the Rhodesian Sanctions Order, which although it did not prevent the Order being passed through Parliament, did have the effect of causing great difficulties for the Heath Government.[53]

The Club's campaign continued despite its admission that it had failed to exert any influence on any of the successive Governments on the issue of Africa. For example, in a 1970 editorial of Monday World, it conceded that it had failed "...to preserve the Central African Federation and to maintain a British presence in Southern Africa."[54] The Club did claim to have effected Edward Heath's decision on arms to South Africa. As discussed in chapter two, the Conservative Party's promise to sell arms to South Africa was put into practice, and during the Heath administration Britain supplied military hardware to South Africa. It had been suggested by Robert Copping that the Monday

---

52. Stuart, op. cit., p.65.

53. Ibid., p.51.

54. Monday World, Spring 1970, p.2.

Club may well have exerted some influence on the Heath administration on this particular matter.[55] However, he presents no evidence. Indeed, Heath had declared its intention to sell arms to South Africa when the Conservatives were in opposition (House of Commons 19th December 1967), after which, the Club's literature declared its support for the sale of arms to South Africa.[56]

As for the Club's race and immigration policy, its views aided recruitment and retention of some members whilst others left as they attempted to distance themselves from the race issue. Nevertheless, the Club's race and immigration policy drew attention away from other issues and consequently made the Club appear as a single-issue group. As suggested above, the Club's race and immigration policy became more extreme after 1964 when its membership increased and it attempted to become a mass organisation. Events that followed, such as Powell's 'Rivers of Blood' speech and the Ugandan Asian crisis gave the Club further opportunity to express its views. For example, in October 1972 a pamphlet by the left wing group, the Labour Research Department, argued that the likes of the Monday Club, Powell and the NF sought to make capital from the announcement of the expulsion of Ugandan Asians.[57] However, it was the Club that the

---

55. Copping, 1972, op. cit., p.22.

56. Monday Club Newsletter, January 1968, p.3 and Monday Club Newsletter October/November 1970, p.5.

57. Labour Research, vol. 61, No.10, 1972, p.220.

pamphlet focussed on, claiming that its involvement in the opposition to the entry of the Ugandan Asians was worrying as it contained figures, such as Geoffrey Rippon (Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster), Julian Amery (Housing Minister), John Peyton (transport Minister) and Victor Goodhew (assistant whip). Although there is no direct evidence to suggest that the Club's race and immigration policy did influence the Conservative Party, Conservative Governments and the modern British Right, Roger Eatwell argues that the Conservative Governments' legislation to restrict immigration marked a shift away from the "bi-partisan" approach to immigration and "much of the credit for this dramatic change must go to the activities of Enoch Powell, the right-wing Conservative ginger group the Monday Club, and local campaigning"[58] Likewise, the Club did suggest that some effect had been achieved with reference to the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) which the Club opposed. In a policy paper produced in 1982 by the Club's Immigration Committee, it repeated its attack on the CRE. According to the policy paper the Club's attack had not gone unnoticed. The House of Commons Affairs Select Committee was quoted as having criticised the CRE for its lack of objectives (the policy paper did not demonstrate a direct link), and on May 4th 1982, Mr. Ivor Stanbrook, MP received the support of 53 MPs when he tried to introduce a bill to abolish the CRE.[59] However, the bill was not successful in becoming legislation.

---

58. Eatwell, op. cit., p.181.

59. DPW/40/25, Policy Paper No. I.R.2, London: Monday Club, 1982, p.4.

As we have seen, Powell often spoke for the Club as they were close in their views of both immigration and economics, but where the Club was divided on Europe, opposition was the key for Powell. Conversely, where the Club formed in defense of Empire, Powell rejected continued identification with Empire as impractical and debilitating.[60]

Attempting to establish definite influence is more difficult than suggesting when particular claims have exaggerated (or even understated) the Club's impact on events and we can see both the attractions and difficulties of Dahl's approach to actually establishing where influence can be demonstrated or disproved with real certainty. Former members are reluctant to claim that the Club had influence on the Conservative Party or Conservative Governments. Graham Webster-Gardiner declared that the Monday Club made it difficult for the Conservative Party to be too left wing on some issues such as Rhodesia and was an "irritant".[61] Howarth noted that the Club's influence, if any, was hard to quantify, as it was not the only group around at the time espousing the same views. Rather in terms of influence on the Party, he claims it provided a check on Heath's

---

60. Gamble, op. cit., 1974, pp.38-45; Enoch Powell, Powell, Freedom and Reality, Kingswood: Elliot Right Way Books, 1969, pp.326-331.

61. Interview with Graham Webster-Gardiner, 28th April 1998.

policies.[62] Surprisingly, Andrew Hunter when interviewed believed the most influential period for the Club was in the mid 1970s, when many commentators have described the Club as a spent force due to its leadership challenge in 1973. He argues this point because he claims that Thatcher was "very enthusiastic on the Monday Club" and the Club's key figures such as John Biggs-Davison was an adviser to Thatcher in the early stages of her leadership.[63]

As has been noted in the second chapter, some writers described the Club's in-fighting as leading to its demise. However, the former Monday Club members interviewed gave Mrs. Thatcher's ascendancy as Party leader as the reason for the Club's reduced strength. As has been previously indicated the Club believed that Thatcher was the leader of the Conservative Party that could bring the Party back to traditional Tory principles. It declared that it felt "relief...that at last the leadership of the party has passed into the hands of one who believes...that the Tory Party should hold to a Tory policy."[64]

It was Gerald Howarth's opinion that once Mrs. Thatcher became leader of the Conservative Party "mainstream thinking was going our way", thus making the Club

---

62. Interview with Gerald Howarth, 29th April 1998.

63. Interview with Andrew Hunter, 8th June 1998.

64. The Party Leadership and The Monday Club, London: Monday Club, 1976, p.1.

redundant.[65] He claimed that once Thatcher was leader the Club's aims had been achieved. He declared that the Club was the type of group that could thrive as long as it had something to press against such as when Heath was Prime Minister and it was trying to persuade him to change his policies.[66] Graham Webster-Gardiner echoed Howarth's views on the effect on the Club of Thatcher becoming leader.[67] Likewise, Hunter declared that the Monday Club's decline during the Thatcher years was "inevitable", because the Club had achieved its objective. So he argues the Club's support for Thatcher's leadership and her success, was "self-defeating".[68]

The Club was prominent and visible in the late 1960s and early 1970s. However, it was less so by the 1980s. Despite this, the importance of the Club lay in the fact that it often expressed what many ordinary Conservatives thought, but the habit of loyalty to the Conservative Party leadership was such that the Club could never win support at the Party Conferences or within the Parliamentary Party. Rather than influence upon the Conservative Party or Conservative Governments, it is more the case that that it added to right wing pressure within the Party. The Club can, however, be judged as having attracted members to the right wing that may not have joined. What remains to be asked

---

65. Interview with Gerald Howarth, 29th April 1998.

66. Ibid.

67. Interview with Graham Webster-Gardiner, 28th April 1998.

68. Interview with Andrew Hunter, 8th June 1998.

is why the Monday Club was not successful in its aim of trying to influence the Conservative Party? This is partly due to the nature of the British party system and the nature of the Conservative Party. With the party system, groups tend to form around single issues and attempt to alter legislation. The Monday Club differs in this aspect as it has a comprehensive policy framework and it attempts to bring pressure on the Government or Party and at times has been highly critical of the Party leadership. Therefore, as was suggested by Seyd and has been echoed by others, the Club is novel, not only in its Conservatism but also in its intra-party activities. Thus it has been declared by some that the Club is the only contemporary Conservative Party faction to have attempted to gain attention and mobilise support.[69] It was seen by Layton-Henry and Gamble as the only faction within the Conservative Party that used the party structure in an attempt to influence the Conservative party and its leadership, by focussing on resolutions at Conference and attempting to influence Parliamentary selection.[70]

However, Layton Henry argues that factionalism provides little guidance to the development of Conservative Party policies and he claims that the resulting Party policies are more attributed to the mood of the electorate rather than any factional activity.[71] It

---

69. Layton-Henry, 1980, op. cit., p.241.

70. Ibid., and Gamble, 1974, op. cit., p.106.

71. Ibid., p.242.

cannot be shown that the Club as such was influential on the Conservative Governments and Conservative Party. Instead the Club was part of a constellation of groups that espoused many of the same views. Hence, where the Club shared ground with other components of the New Right would appear to have been of considerably greater significance for the direction of Conservatism than any isolated input of its own. And in understanding this, we can also see that it did not exercise a major influence on the British Right as a whole. This remained economic liberal, chary of race and unwilling to follow the Monday Club further to the right.

Where it might appear that the Club has had some influence or effect on the Conservative Party or Conservative Government policy, the Club has shared ground with more significant forces on the New Right. Policies that may have been influential were not exclusive to the Club, rather they were being espoused by other groups or individuals at that time. But when studying the Monday Club, how influential it has been on the Conservative Party, Conservative Governments and the modern British Right is not the only key to its importance. As discussed above, the important aspects when studying the Club are its novelty of its conservatism, its role as an inter-party faction and its ability to attract members to the Conservative Party that may not have joined. It has been a highly visible force since its inception in the sixties. But it espoused a particular kind of conservatism, which for a consistent definition is best classified as radical right, which left it outside the main forces driving Conservatism and Britain to the right in the closing decades of the twentieth century.

Bibliography

Published Sources

Books

Ansell, Amy Elizabeth, New Right, New Racism: Race and Reaction in the US and Britain, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1997.

Aughey, Arthur, Under Siege: Ulster Unionism and the Anglo Irish Agreement, London: Hurst and Co., 1993.

Aughey, Arthur, Jones, Greta and Riches, W.T.M., The Conservative Political Tradition in Britain and the United States, London: Pinter Publishers Ltd., 1992.

Baker, David, Ideology of Obsession: A.K.Chesterton and British Fascism, London: Tauris Academic Studies, 1996.

Ball, Stuart and Seldon, Anthony, The Heath Government 1970-74, Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman, 1996.

Barker, Martin, The New Racism: Conservatives and the ideology of the tribe, Frederick: Aletheia Books, 1981.

Barry, Norman P., The New Right, Beckenham: Croom Helm Ltd., 1987.

Bew, Paul and Gillespie, Gordon, Northern Ireland: A Chronology of the Troubles 1968-1993, Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1993.

Brivati, Brian and Jones, Harriet, From Reconstruction to Integration: Britain and Europe Since 1945, London: Leicester University Press, 1993.

Callaghan, John, Great Power Complex: British Imperialism, International Crises and National Decline, 1914-51, London: Pluto Press, 1997.

Calvocoressi, Peter, World Politics Since 1945, Harlow: Longman, 1982.

Childs, David, Britain Since 1945, London: Ernst Benn, 1979.

Connolly, William, The Terms of Political Discourse, (2nd Edition), Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1983.

Copping, Robert, The Story of the Monday Club, WestCliff-on-Sea: Current Affairs Information Service, 1972.

Copping, Robert, The Monday Club – Crisis and After, Westcliff-on-Sea: Current Affairs Information Service, 1975.

Crossman, Richard, The Diaries of a Cabinet Minister vol. I, London: Hamilton Cape, 1975.

Crossman, Richard, The Diaries of a Cabinet Minister vol II 1966 - 68, London: Hamilton Cape, 1976.

Dorril, Stephen and Ramsay, Robin, Smear! Wilson and the Secret State, London: Grafton, 1992.

Dunleavy, Patrick, et al (eds.), Developments in British Politics 4, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1993.

Eatwell, Roger and O' Sullivan, Noel (eds.), The Nature of the Right, London: Pinter Publishers, 1989.

Freeden, Michael, Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Gamble, Andrew, The Conservative Nation, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1974.

Gamble, Andrew, Britain in Decline: Economic Policy, Political Strategy and the British State (4th Edition), Houndmills: Macmillan, 1994.

Gamble, Andrew, Free Economy and Strong State: The Politics of Thatcherism, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1988.

Green, David G., The New Right: The Counter Revolution in Political, Economic and Social Thought, Brighton: Wheatsheaf Books, 1987.

Griffen, Roger (ed.), Fascism, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Gupta, Partha Sarathi, Imperialism and the British Labour Movement 1914 – 1964, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1975.

Heffer, Simon, Like The Roman: The Life of Enoch Powell, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1998.

Layton-Henry, Zig (ed.), Conservative Party Politics, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1980.

Layton-Henry, Zig, The Politics of Immigration, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1992.

Ludlam, Steve and Smith, Martin J. (eds.), Contemporary British Conservatism, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1996.

Lukes, Steven, Power: A Radical View, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1974.

Lynch, Philip The Politics of Nationhood: Sovereignty, Britishness and Conservative Politics, Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1999.

Marwick, Arthur, British Society Since 1945, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990.

McIlroy, John, Trade Unions in Britain Today, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.

McIntyre, W. David, British Decolonisation, 1946- 1997, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1998.

Morris, Rupert, Tories: From Village Hall to Westminster a Political Sketch, Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing Company, 1991.

Mudde, Cas, The Ideology of the Extreme Right, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

Nevin, Edward, The Economics of Europe, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1990.

Norton, Philip, Conservative Dissidents: Dissent within the Parliamentary Conservative Party 1970-74, London: Temple Smith, 1978.

Nugent, Neill and King, Roger (eds.), The British Right: Conservative and Right Wing Politics in Britain, Farnborough: Saxon House, 1977.

O'Leary, Brendan and McGarry, John, The Politics of Antagonism: Understanding Northern Ireland, London: The Athlone Press, 1993.

Ramsden, John, The Making of Conservative Party Politics: The Conservative Research Department Since 1929, New York: Longman, 1980.

Seawright, David, An Importance Matter of Principle the Decline of the Scottish Conservative and Unionist Party, Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.

Selden, Raman (ed.), The Theory of Criticism: From Plato to the Present, Harlow: Longman, 1988.

Solomos, John, Race and Racism in Contemporary Britain, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1989.

Thompson, Paul, The Voice of the Past: Oral History, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Walker, Martin, The National Front, London: Fontana, 1977.

Whitehead, Philip, The Writing on the Wall: Britain in the Seventies, London: Michael Joseph Ltd., 1985.

Whyte, John, Interpreting Northern Ireland, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Wilson, Tom, Ulster: Conflict and Consent, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Young, Hugo, This Blessed Plot: Britain and Europe From Churchill to Blair, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1998.

Young, John W., Britain and the World in the Twentieth Century, New York: Arnold, 1997.

Pamphlets

Baber, Geoffrey, Standing Room Only - the Population Problem in Britain, London: Monday Club, 1971.

Costello, Brian, Referenda; PR – Whose Decision?, London: Monday Club, 1975.

Forth, Eric, The Draft Treaty of European Union, London: Monday Club, 1988.

Goodhew, Victor, Self Help Reborn, London: Monday Club, 1968.

Keigwin, Tim, Those Five Foolish Principles, London: Monday Club, 1970.

Keigwin, Tim, One Man One Vote: Africa A to Z, London: Monday Club, 1969.

Labour Research Department, Powell and His Allies, London: Labour Research Department, 1969.

Laud, Derek, Law, Order and Race Relations, London: Monday Club, 1984.

Minford, Patrick, Economic Strategy, London: Monday Club, 1986.

Minford, Patrick, Why We Need Bold Tax Cuts on March 14, London: Monday Club, 1989.

Monday Club, Bury the Hatchet, London: Monday Club, 1962.

Monday Club, Economic Affairs, London: Monday Club, 1966.

Monday Club, Economic Policy for the 1970s, London: Monday Club, 1968.

Monday Club, Europe...The Unguarded Legacy: A Conservative Approach to European Unity, London: Monday Club, 1977.

Monday Club, Facing the Facts on Rhodesia, London: Monday Club, 1966.

Monday Club, Guardian of the Tory Conscience, London: Monday Club, 1981.

Monday Club, Immigration – An Untenable Situation, London: Monday Club, 1981.

Monday Club, Immigration into the UK - Policy Paper No. IR2, London: Monday Club, 1982.

Monday Club, Ireland Our Cuba?, London: Monday Club, 1970.

Monday Club, Killing the Dinosaur of State Ownership: Programme for Privatisation, London: Monday Club, 1984.

Monday Club, Money – Yours or Theirs?, London: Monday Club, 1968.

Monday Club, Out! Out! Out!, London: Monday Club, 1985.

Monday Club, Proposals for a Constitutional Settlement, London: Monday Club, 1982.

Monday Club, Race Relations - 11th Hour, London: Monday Club, October 1986.

Monday Club, Red Clouds Over Africa, London: Monday Club, 1978.

Monday Club, Rhodesia and the Threat to the West, London: Monday Club, 1976.

Monday Club, Rhodesia to Zimbabwe – An Assessment, London: Monday Club, 1982.

Monday Club, Should Britain Join?, London: Monday Club, 1966.

Monday Club, State and the Economy: the Need for a Tory Rethink, London: Monday Club, 1972.

Monday Club, Strike Out or Strike Bound?, London: Monday Club, 1963.

Monday Club, The Aims of the Monday Club, London: Monday Club, 1967.

Monday Club, The Party Leadership and The Monday Club, London: Monday Club, 1976.

Monday Club, Ulster in Your Hands, London: Monday Club, 1972.

Monday Club, Why Bankrupt the Efficient and then Have to Pay More to Support the Jobless?, London: Monday Club, 1980.

Monday Club, Why Europe Needs Spain, London: Monday Club, 1977.

Monday Club, Why should the death penalty be reinstated: An appraisal, London: Monday Club, 1988.

Monday Club, Winds of Change or Whirlwind? London: Monday Club, 1961.

Montagu, Victor, The Conservative Dilemma, London: Monday Club, 1970.

Pearce, Simon, Education and the Multi-Racial Society, London: Monday Club, 1985.

Rippon, Geoffrey, Right Angle, London: Monday Club, 1969.

Storey, David and Taylor, Edward, The Conservative Party and the Common Market, London: Monday Club, 1982.

Storey, David, Wanted a Positive Policy for Ulster, London: Monday Club, 1988.

Young, George K, Who Goes Home? - Immigration and Repatriation, London: Monday Club, 1969.

Chapters for edited books

Baker, David, Gamble, Andrew and Ludlam, Steve, "The Current Problems of the Conservative Party"; Dunleavy, Patrick and Stanyer, Jeffrey, (eds.), Contemporary Political Studies, Belfast: PSA of the UK, 1994.

Brooke, Stephen, "The Conservative Party, Immigration and National Identity, 1948-1968" in Francis, Martin and Zweiniger-Bargielowska, Ina (eds.), The Conservatives and British Society 1880-1990, Cardiff: University of Press, 1996.

Dunleavy, Patrick, "The Political Parties" in Dunleavy, Patrick, et al (eds.), Developments in British Politics 4, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1993.

Durham, Martin, ""The Conservative Party, the British Extreme Right and the Problem of Political Space, 1967-83" in Cronin, Mike, The Failure of British Fascism: The Far Right and the Fight for Political Recognition, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1996.

Eatwell, Roger, "The extreme right and British exceptionalism: the primacy of politics" in Hainsworth, Paul (ed.), The Politics of the Extreme Right from the Margins to the Mainstream, London: Continuum Imprint, 2000.

Edgar, David, "Bitter Harvest" in Curran, John (ed.), The Future of the Left, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984.

Edgar, David, "The free and the good", in Levitas, Ruth (ed.), The Ideology of the New Right, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1986.

Greenleaf, W. H., "The Character of Modern British Conservatism" in Benewick, Robert, Berki, R. N., and Parekh, Bhikhu, (eds.), Knowledge and Belief in Politics: the Problem of Ideology, London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1973.

Griffin, Roger, "The Radical Right in the Post-Fascist Era" in Freeden, Michael (ed.), Reassessing Politcal Ideologies: Durability of Dissent, London: Routledge, 2001.

Articles

Baker, David, Gamble, Andrew and Ludlam, Steve, "The Current Problems of the Conservative Party"; Contemporary Political Studies, PSA, 1994, pp.278-297.

"Exit the Reluctant Hero", Economist, 5th May 1974, pp. 24-25.

Hart, LT.-CDR. Michael, R.N., "Britain and the Common Market", The National Message, British Israel Movement, June 1972, pp.180-181.

McElvoy, Anne, "Tory Boy", New Statesman, 13th November 2000, pp.18-19.

Michaels, David, "Monday Club Discovers Maurras", Patterns of Prejudice, March/April 1972, p. 14.

Seyd, Patrick, "Factionalism within the Conservative Party: The Monday Club", Government and Opposition, Vol.7, No.4, 1972, pp.464-487.

Stuart, Mark, "A Party in Three Pieces: The Conservative Split over Rhodesian Oil Sanctions, 1965": Contemporary British History, Vol. 16, No. 1, Spring 2002, pp.51-88.

Interviews

Interview with Gerald Howarth, at House of Commons, 29th April 1998.

Interview with Graham Webster-Gardiner, at Royal Brierley Crystal, 28th April 1998.

Interview with Andrew Hunter, at House of Commons, 8th June 1998.

Interview with Patrick Seyd at Sheffield University on 17th May 1995.

Newspapers and Magazines

Daily Telegraph

Economist

Guardian

Monday Club Newsletter

Monday News

Monday World

Observer

Patterns of Prejudice

Right Ahead

Searchlight

Sunday Telegraph

The Times

Tory Challenge

Internet

"S.Africa: Amnesty hearing put off for Hani's Killers", www.cnn.com/WORLD/9706/23/south.africa.Hani/

Gavin Evans, "Infiltrating the Monday Club", 18th August 1999, p.3 on: www.dailymail&guardian.com/18aug-mondayclub.html

Unpublished Sources

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Conservative Party Archives, files:

Conservative Chairman's Office correspondence files:

CCO 3/6/16 Monday Club 1961-1962 (open)

CCO 3/7/33 Monday Club 1967-1970 (permission required)

Conservative Chairman's Office papers (permission required):

CCO 20/43/1 Monday Club 1964-1967

CCO 20/43/4 Monday Club 1967-1969

CCO 20/43/6 Monday Club 1969-1974

University of Hull Archives:

Patrick Wall Collection (DPW) files:

DPW/40/1-75 1961-1989

DPW/9/47 'Monday Club University Group' 1968-1970

DPW/26/13 Executive Committee members, branches and officers, 1974-1989